

NAYS—102

Abbitt	Fisher	Passman
Abernethy	Fountain	Pike
Andrews,	Fulton, Tenn.	Quile
George W.	Gettys	Randall
Andrews,	Gross	Reld, Ill.
Glenn	Grover	Reifel
Andrews,	Gubser	Robison
N. Dak.	Gurney	Rogers, Fla.
Arends	Hagan, Ga.	Roybal
Ashbrook	Haley	Rumsfeld
Ashmores	Hall	Satterfield
Bennett	Hansen, Idaho	Scott
Berry	Harsha	Secrest
Bolton	Henderson	Selden
Bow	Hutchinson	Sikes
Brook	Jonas	Skubitz
Brown, Ohio	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.	Jones, N.C.	Stalbaum
Buchanan	King, N.Y.	Stanton
Burton, Utah	Kornegay	Stephens
Cameron	Langen	Talcott
Cederberg	Latta	Taylor
Chamberlain	Lennon	Tuck
Clancy	McClory	Tuten
Conable	McCulloch	Utt
Cramer	McEwen	Walker, N. Mex.
Cunningham	McMillan	Watson
Curtis	MacGregor	Weitner
Derwinski	Michel	Whitener
Devine	Minshall	Whitten
Dickinson	Morton	Williams
Dole	Nelsen	Wilson, Bob
Dulski	O'Hara, Mich.	Wolf
Edwards, Ala.	O'Neal, Ga.	Wylder
Edlenborn	Ottinger	Younger

NOT VOTING—41

Adair	Fuqua	Mosher
Baring	Hagen, Calif.	Pool
Bell	Halleck	Powell
Bolling	Hanna	Reinecke
Brown, Calif.	Harvey, Ind.	Roncallo
Clawson, Del.	Holifield	Roudebush
Collier	Ichord	Sisk
Conyers	Landrum	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	McCarthy	Toll
Delaney	McVicker	Waggonner
Dowdy	Martin, Ala.	Walker, Miss.
Downing	Mathias	Willis
Everett	Matthews	Wyatt
Fraser	Miller	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Teague of Texas for, with Mr. Waggonner against.

Mr. Downing for, with Mr. Davis of Georgia against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Roncallo against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Baring with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Miller with Mr. Reinecke.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Martin of Alabama.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. Matthews with Mr. McVicker.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Pool.

Mr. RUMSFELD, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. FOUNTAIN, and Mr. SKUBITZ changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up

House Resolution 773, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 773

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] pending which I yield myself such time as I may require.

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 773 provides that points of order shall be waived in the consideration of H.R. 13546, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13546 includes \$13,135,719,000, the amount of the budget estimate for the military assistance and economic assistance programs of the Government directly related to operations in southeast Asia. This involves an increase in the numbers of both military and civilian personnel, the increases in the operation and maintenance costs of men, machines, and structures; the production of aircraft, ordnance, ammunition, and other materiel; military and construction projects; selected and specialized research and development programs; and also economic assistance.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection I would like to address a question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I wonder if the chairman would advise the House as to whether or not this bill appropriates a sufficient amount of money to carry on the war in Vietnam.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I believe so, at least for the time being. With the funds included in this bill we will have made available for the current fiscal year a total of about \$61 billion for the Department of Defense. We entered the current fiscal year with about \$30 billion in the hands of the Department of Defense which had not been expended. Most of those funds had been committed for such things as missiles, airplanes, submarines, ships, and other long lead time items. So I would say certainly from the financial standpoint the funds provided here are adequate for the foreseeable future. Of course, we cannot tell whether peace will come or whether war will remain at the present level or whether it will escalate. So we do not know how much additional funds may be required even this year for the further prosecution of this war if it continues.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that answer. I wanted to point out that all of us are concerned over reports that we hear from

time to time of shortages over in Vietnam. We realize that there are bound to be isolated items of that nature and we want these shortages to be eliminated as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from a constituent of mine, a responsible citizen, who has a son, a lance corporal in the Marine Corps in Vietnam, who is complaining of the lack of jungle boots for the Marine Corps troops over there while the Army has them. I want to ask the chairman to have someone on his staff check on this matter, please?

Mr. MAHON. I would say with respect to equipment and clothing for the men in Vietnam that I know of no real shortage, no significant shortage.

Of course, there may be a temporary shortage at a given place at a given moment. I shall be glad to present this matter to the appropriate officials in the Department of Defense. We conferred at great length with General Greene, the commandant of the Marine Corps, and discussed with him some problems with regard to supplies, but he did not complain of any serious problem of supplies in Vietnam at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the hearing record is already clear that the committee does not preclude the introduction of another supplemental appropriation bill with respect to expenditures for this purpose. I seem to get the very definite impression that another supplemental is not precluded at all.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I do hope to leave the very definite impression that another supplemental is not precluded. In my opinion, and it would be my hope, there will be no further supplemental for fiscal 1966 related to the war in Vietnam, but there may be a supplemental for fiscal 1967. We do not want to give to the Department of Defense a blank check. Last year we did not want to give the Department of Defense billions of dollars for which it could not define a specific use. So we feel, as I am sure the gentleman from Iowa feels, when funds are required the officials of the executive branch should come to the Congress and request the funds, and then we will provide them, as we are undertaking to do in this case. However, no one can predict the future. It has not been possible to predict it in any war which we have fought.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but I am not too well satisfied, from a reading of the hearings, that you have adequately financed the situation as it presently stands.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, we have just done the best we could under the circumstances.

I must say that in another supplemental bill which will be pending before the House of Representatives, probably before Easter, funds will be carried almost to the extent of \$1 billion because of pay increases for members of the armed services and civilian employees as a result of legislation passed last year.

had they come to us on their own two feet and in not such objectionable company.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress I have protested these discriminatory taxes in good times and bad—in time of budget deficits and budget surpluses. There is simply no right time to vote for an unfair tax. I submit that the administration has not tried hard enough either through economies here at home or through recommendations for tax equality to properly provide the revenue needed to fulfill our most pressing commitments.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, since the President's state of the Union message, which contained his request for postponing the repeal of telephone and automobile excise taxes, I have been on record as strongly opposed to reinstituting these regressive taxes as a means of procuring the needed funds to finance the war in Vietnam.

I was most encouraged when the Senate last week adopted the amendment to keep the excise on residential phone service at its present 3-percent rate. Unfortunately, the conference committee deleted the Senate amendment, with the result that the tax on local telephone service will again rise to 10 percent. Without any wavering in my strong support for well-reasoned legislation to obtain the needed additional funds for use in Vietnam, I am reluctant to support the conference report because of the unnecessary burden it places on people in the lower income levels, to whom an automobile and telephone service are necessities, not luxuries, today.

With this hesitation, I have decided to vote in favor of the conference committee's compromise, because of another provision it contains. I am referring to the provision that will provide social security benefits to over 300,000 American citizens who are reaching the age of 72 and are not covered by social security under present law. This provision is an important step in broadening our social security system to cover those who had retired or were near retirement when Congress acted to cover jobs they had held.

I have been urging the passage of this amendment to the Social Security Act for over a year now. Across-the-board monthly benefits for persons reaching age 72 who do not meet normal quarter-coverage requirements was a major part of H.R. 5039, which I introduced last year—many provisions of which were later enacted into Public Law 89-97.

Under this enlightened provision, persons who are not now receiving any State, Federal, or local pension, in most cases persons who are most in need, will receive \$35 monthly through the social security system if they reach age 72 before 1968. For persons reaching age 72 after 1967, this new provision provides that fewer quarters of covered employment will be required for eligibility for social security benefits. Thus, over \$120 million will be made available to persons who qualify under this section.

While I have very serious reservations about the wisdom of reimposing the same excise taxes which Congress worked

so diligently to repeal just last year, I cannot with conscience vote down this very necessary and enlightened step in the broadening of our social security laws to cover needy senior citizens. I am gratified at the inclusion in this report of a major portion of my own social security legislative program.

Thus, with noted reluctance, I am casting my vote in favor of the conference committee's report on the Tax Adjustment Act.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to state that I will again vote, very reluctantly, for this tax increase measure, called the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966. As I stated on February 23, when the bill was first approved by the House—see page 3552 of the RECORD—only the administration's refusal to cut back on its unprecedented high level of domestic spending constrains me to vote for this bill. In this absence of fiscal restraint on the part of the administration, which increases the dangers of inflation it becomes necessary to provide the additional revenues in this legislation. The costs of the war in Vietnam and threat of inflation demands it.

At the same time, I wish to add a word of high praise for the amendment adopted in the Senate to give older persons at least some assistance by extending a measure of social security protection to many of those excluded from the program through no fault of their own. I am proud of the fact that my State's senior Senator, NORRIS COTTON, played such a prominent role in sponsoring this amendment and getting it adopted. With all the money being poured out by the Government on various welfare programs, it is good to know that at least some will now go to relieve the needs of senior citizens directly, without Federal controls or new battalions of bureaucrats. This is an antipoverty measure which I can support. It follows the precedent we established at Republican insistence, when we provided medical care for the elderly not covered by social security.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may include their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the conference report. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], and others who have spoken on this conference report may have permission to revise and extend our remarks and to include certain tables and charts that refer to this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Arkansas? There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 288, nays 102, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—288

Adams	Glaimo	Murray
Addabbo	Gibbons	Natcher
Albert	Gilbert	Nedzi
Anderson, Ill.	Gilligan	Nix
Anderson, Tenn.	Gonzalez	O'Brien
Annunzio	Goodell	O'Hara, Ill.
Ashley	Grabowski	O'Konski
Aspinall	Gray	Olsen, Mont.
Ayres	Green, Oreg.	Olsen, Minn.
Bandistra	Green, Pa.	O'Neill, Mass.
Barrett	Grelgg	Patman
Bates	Grider	Patten
Battin	Griffin	Pelly
Beckworth	Griffiths	Pepper
Belcher	Halpern	Perkins
Betts	Hamilton	Philbin
Bingham	Hanley	Pickle
Blatnik	Hansen, Iowa	Pirnie
Boggs	Hansen, Wash.	Poage
Boland	Hardy	Poff
Brademas	Harvey, Mich.	Price
Bray	Hathaway	Pucinski
Brooks	Hawkins	Purcell
Broomfield	Hays	Quillen
Broyhill, Va.	Hébert	Race
Burke	Hechler	Redin
Burleson	Helstoski	Rees
Burton, Calif.	Herlong	Reid, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Hicks	Resnick
Byrnes, Wis.	Holland	Reuss
Cabell	Horton	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cahill	Hoemer	Rhodes, Pa.
Callan	Howard	Rivers, S.C.
Callaway	Hull	Rivers, Alaska
Carey	Hungate	Roberts
Carter	Huot	Rodino
Casey	Irwin	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Jacobs	Rogers, Tex.
Chelf	Jarman	Ronan
Clark	Jennings	Rooney, N.Y.
Clausen	Joelson	Rooney, Pa.
Don H. Cleveland	Johnson, Calif.	Rosenthal
Clevenger	Johnson, Okla.	Rostenkowski
Cohen	Johnson, Pa.	Roush
Colmer	Jones, Ala.	Ryan
Conte	Karsten	St. Germain
Cooley	Karth	St. Onge
Corbett	Kastenmeter	Saylor
Corman	Kee	Scheuer
Craley	Keith	Schisler
Culver	Kelly	Schmidhauser
Curtin	Keogh	Schneebell
Daddario	King, Calif.	Schwelker
Dague	King, Utah	Senner
Daniels	Kirwan	Shipley
Davis, Wis.	Kluczynski	Shriver
Dawson	Krebs	Sickles
de la Garza	Kunkel	Slack
Dent	Kupferman	Smith, Iowa
Denton	Laird	Smith, N.Y.
Diggs	Leggett	Smith, Va.
Dingell	Lipscomb	Springer
Donohue	Long, La.	Stafford
Dorn	Long, Md.	Staggers
Dow	Love	Steed
Duncan, Oreg.	McDade	Stratton
Duncan, Tenn.	McDowell	Stubblefield
Dwyer	McFall	Sullivan
Dyal	McGrath	Sweeney
Edmondson	Macdonald	Teague, Calif.
Edwards, Calif.	Machen	Tenzer
Edwards, La.	Mackay	Thompson, N.J.
Ellsworth	Mackie	Thompson, Tex.
Evans, Colo.	Madden	Thomson, Wis.
Evins, Tenn.	Mahon	Todd
Fallon	Mailliard	Trimble
Farbstein	Marsh	Tunney
Farnsley	Martin, Mass.	Tupper
Farnum	Martin, Nebr.	Udall
Fascell	Matsunaga	Ullman
Feighan	May	Van Deerlin
Findley	Meeds	Vanik
Fino	Mills	Vigorito
Flood	Minish	Vivian
Flynt	Mink	Watkins
Fogarty	Mize	Watts
Foley	Moeller	Whalley
Ford, Gerald R.	Monagan	White, Idaho
Ford	Moore	White, Tex.
William D. Frelinghuysen	Moorhead	Wildnall
Friedel	Morgan	Wilson
Fulton, Pa.	Morris	Charles H. Wright
Gallagher	Morrison	Yates
Garmatz	Morse	Young
Gathings	Moss	Zablocki
	Multer	
	Murphy, Ill.	
	Murphy, N.Y.	

Mr. GROSS. That is one of the items in your hearings here, and I am a little bit surprised that that item is not covered in this bill.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, the pending bill includes funds for the new rates of pay for the additional men in the Armed Forces. We have almost 400,000 more men in the Armed Forces than we previously had programed in the original 1966 budget. However, this bill does not take care of the supplemental required, as a result of the pay increase, for the originally programed numbers of military, which we provided for at the old rates in the regular 1966 appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. And yet this bill takes into account expenditures, other than for those directly related to Vietnam?

Mr. MAHON. To some quite limited extent.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, to some extent. This is the point I am trying to make, that this supplemental is not all-inclusive; that we are already looking at another supplemental to take care of the pay increase.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And, I cannot help but be a little surprised that it is not contained in this bill rather than another bill yet to come to the floor of the House.

Mr. MAHON. We had thought that we should present all the pay increases for the whole Government in one bill. It is anticipated that that bill may be before the House for action week after next.

Mr. GROSS. One other question: Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] explain briefly to the House why points of order are waived in this bill?

Mr. YOUNG. Of course, it is obvious that the points of order are waived because the authorization bill has not been passed or signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Has it passed the other body?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; it is in conference. Mr. GROSS. But it has not been signed by the President?

Mr. YOUNG. No; it is in conference. Mr. MAHON. The economic assistance portion of the bill is in conference.

Mr. YOUNG. The foreign aid part is still in conference, and the other part of the bill has gone to the President but has not been signed.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, for a question.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to raise this question at this time, but since the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has raised it, I am concerned about shortages of clothing that have been revealed during the hearings which have been held by the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, as well as in the hearings which have been held by the Armed Services Committee of the other body.

Do I understand the gentleman to say that there were no shortages of clothing in the Marine Corps, or that these shortages were being taken care of?

Mr. Speaker, I am addressing my question to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield further, the Department of Defense is requesting additional funds here to meet certain requirements for additional manpower. We have increased manpower to the extent of about 400,000 men in the last year.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as I know there are no significant shortages in South Vietnam. There are some shortages within the continental United States which are of no serious import in my judgment. And, these requirements are being met.

Mr. Speaker, there could not be a military effort of this magnitude without some shortages showing up here and there. The Department of Defense has tried to husband its funds rather well, in my opinion, in recent years. Officials have not asked for supplies to last for the next 20 or 30 years of certain items, as has been the case in some isolated instances heretofore.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this more accurate and careful budgeting procedure is in the public interest, and generally would be approved. Of course, we do not want any shortages that would be significant, we do not want any shortages at all, but these shortages will occur in any war. Therefore, we have to do the best we can to see that these shortages are not significant or hurtful to the fighting forces.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, since the gentleman from Texas has mentioned General Green's testimony, his testimony before the Committee on Armed Services revealed that there were shortages of clothing, but that they were being taken care of through the medium of decreased clothing allowances.

Mr. MAHON. This relates to the continental United States, and not to South Vietnam, I believe.

Mr. LATTA. There will be no decreased allowances as far as clothing is concerned for our South Vietnam fighting soldiers?

Mr. MAHON. Not, I believe, for the soldiers in South Vietnam. There is no clothing problem about which I know, with reference to personnel in Vietnam, except some isolated instance here or there, but some of the clothing under order for the increased strength of the Marine Corps will take a little time for delivery. But there is no serious situation here. And the gentleman to whom the gentleman from Ohio referred, when testifying before the House Armed Services Committee, points out that he thinks the Marine Corps will be able to handle this matter without any serious effect upon the readiness of the marines.

Mr. LATTA. Likewise I will point out to the gentleman that General Greene in his testimony before the Committee on Armed Services stated in their examination of the problem, meaning the problem of ammunition as I recall, they found six different types of ammunition in which there were indications of short-

ages. This is General Greene's testimony: Are there sufficient funds to take care of these shortages?

Mr. MAHON. The bill provides \$2 billion for ammunition and associated equipment. There are certain new types of ammunition that are not immediately available which would be desirable for use in Vietnam which are not now being used. But we have sufficient firepower to meet the requirements. Whatever the deficiencies are in our prosecution of the war in Vietnam, they are not brought about by the lack of money or of supplies, in my judgment.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the pending resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 773 does waive all points of order so far as the bill H.R. 13546 is concerned, the supplemental defense appropriation bill for 1966. As I understand it, the points of order were requested to be waived for two different reasons. The first is the two bills that have been passed, I think \$415 million for the foreign aid bill, and I believe the other one having to do with the armed services and supplies, have not been signed by the President of the United States with the result that we cannot appropriate unless there is first a law on the books authorizing us to do so. That is the first point.

The second point, as I understand it, is that there is certain language in the bill in the nature of legislation in an appropriation bill which is against the rules of the House and the Committee on Rules was asked to waive that so that we could proceed with this legislation here today.

I think the total amount of the bill is somewhere around \$13 billion, \$12.3 billion in new military spending and \$415 million in connection with the foreign aid matter that we passed here a short time ago, the majority of which goes to Vietnam, some to Thailand, some to Laos, and some to the Dominican Republic. Then there is \$375 million for military assistance projects previously authorized and begun.

There has been some discussion as to whether or not the World War II language goes too far; whether that authority should be given to the Department of Defense or not. So far as I am concerned, I feel our men are in Vietnam and they are fighting and I, for one, intend to give them all the equipment and ammunition and everything that we can to help them to do their job so that we can get them back home as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr. Speaker, I support the waiver of the points of order and I support the rule and I support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time so far as I know.

March 15, 1966

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental defense appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate thereon be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be divided equally between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we will use more than 3 hours in general debate, but we do not want to preclude any debate that the House desires to have on this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 13546, with Mr. WRIGHT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. This is the first appropriation bill to be considered by the Congress at this session. We have been requested by the executive branch to appropriate for the forthcoming fiscal year about \$121 billion. The bill before us of course, is not applicable to the 1967 fiscal year but, rather, to the current fiscal year.

There has been so much said about the war in Vietnam through all media and in many public places, including this body and the other body, that there are many who feel, perhaps, that they have heard enough.

But this bill totals \$13 billion. It is the first opportunity of the House of Representatives to express its will on the urgent request of the President for all of the additional funds to prosecute the war in Vietnam.

This supplemental appropriation request for the Department of Defense has occupied much of the time and effort of many Members of the legislative branch in recent weeks. The President's request for the supplemental funds arrived here on Capitol Hill on the 19th day of January. The House Appropriations

Committee began its hearings on the measure on January 26 and concluded hearings on March 3.

Three subcommittees—the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, the Subcommittee on Military Construction, and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations—were all involved in the consideration of this request.

The full Committee on Appropriations met last Friday and ordered the bill reported to the House, and it was scheduled for consideration today.

Since some of the amounts requested required additional authorization, several of the legislative committees of the Congress have given their attention to this matter. The Committee on Armed Forces of the House held hearings beginning February 3 and ending on February 17, having had 8 days of hearings on many of the matters in the bill that is before us today.

The authorization bill was reported from the House Armed Services Committee on February 18 and passed the House on March 1.

In the other body, joint hearings were held by the Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee beginning on January 20 and ending on February 3—5 days of hearings.

The bill was reported to the Senate on February 10. The Senate debate began on that day and continued until the Senate passed the bill on March 1.

The conference report on that authorization bill was filed on March 10 and was adopted by both the Houses last week, as the Members know.

Since the pending bill provides supplemental appropriations for economic assistance, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate have considered the matter and drafted the required authorizing legislation. The House Foreign Affairs Committee began hearings on January 26. The committee held 3 days of hearings. The authorization bill for economic assistance was considered on the floor on February 24.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee began hearings on January 28 and continued hearings until March 3, hearings being held on a total of 8 days. The other body considered the Economic Assistance Authorization bill, as we did, on March 10.

The conference on this economic assistance part of the legislation has not yet been concluded, and the legislation, of course, has not been signed into law. Neither had the military authorization portion of this legislation until today. For that reason a rule waiving points of order was requested by the Appropriations Committee last week and granted by the Rules Committee.

So it is evident that Congress has been preoccupied with the issue of the Vietnam war since we assembled in January, and properly so, I would say.

Last year, during the consideration of the Defense Appropriation and Authorization bills, it became apparent that a supplemental appropriation would be needed early this year if the war should continue. We were hoping and praying

that it would not. This view was generally taken by Members of the House and Members of the other body who deal in depth with military requirements. This view was also taken by officials of the Defense Department.

We were told that additional funds would probably be needed, but since they could not then pinpoint the specific funds; they would not ask us for blank checks for financing the war. It was generally thought that early this year a request for additional funds would be presented. Early this year, on January 19, the request came. So it is no surprise that we have been engaged in recent weeks in debate and discussion of this important matter.

Not only this, but during the course of the consideration thus far of the pending \$13 billion appropriation, it has been apparent that most Members feel that the additional amounts are required.

The truth is that there has been no real question in the minds of the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body that the funds requested are needed. I will go further, and say that many feel that additional funds may be required in fiscal year 1967 for the Department of Defense, that is funds in excess of the budget request.

This certainly is my view, but no one can tell the turn which the war will take and, therefore, what the requirements may actually be.

It is true that we cannot predict, as I say, the course of the war, the chances for peace, or the degree of intensity of the fighting.

We do not know what the Communists might do in southeast Asia or elsewhere. We have no way of knowing. Hence, it is inevitable that some uncertainties will confront us in the future, as they have confronted us in the past in dealing with these matters.

When and if additional sums are required, I would make bold to say for the House of Representatives that everyone can be sure that those additional funds will be approved by the House of Representatives.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the able minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has pointed out that there are many, many uncertainties as to the precise course of the conflict in Vietnam. President Johnson, as the elected Commander in Chief, does not himself know exactly what decisions he must make in the crucial days ahead. We do not know today what the President must do in the way of a commitment for more strength on the ground or in the air or on the sea.

However, I gather, from what the gentleman from Texas is saying, that a Member of the House who votes for this Defense Department appropriation is giving to the Commander in Chief the day-to-day authority to carry on the execution and implementation of our Nation's position of strength in South Vietnam. An "aye" vote on this bill today means that one supports adequate

military strength to meet successfully the challenge of Communist aggression in South Vietnam.

Mr. MAHON. This, I believe, would be a fair interpretation of a vote in favor of the pending legislation.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. It is true that we cannot tell the degree of the escalation, but it is my view—and I have no inside information—that the probabilities are that the war will escalate, that it will grow in intensity, because I do not think our opponents are yet ready to go to the conference table.

We have given them ample opportunity. We have had the bombing pause, and we have been most tolerant and considerate in undertaking to convince our opponents, and the entire world, of our desire for peace. Our efforts have not been successful thus far. We have no other alternative than to prosecute this war to a successful conclusion.

It is in this context and under these circumstances that the Committee on Appropriations brings this request to you today for your consideration.

I would like to say that it is due to the foresight of Congress and to the foresight of the executive branch that we are as well prepared as we are for the conditions which confront us in the world at this time. Beginning in 1950 with the Korean war, we have kept our Military Establishment in a considerable degree of readiness. We have appropriated large sums of money for defense. We have spent money for defense at a rather high level since the early 1950's in order to be ready to meet aggression if aggression came.

I should call your attention to some significant facts:

First. We have carried more than 200,000 men and the arms and equipment to support them and to support our allies' army of more than 800,000 men, by air and by sea, more than 10,000 miles from our shores.

Second. We have wisely protected the lives of our fightingmen by expending munitions at tremendous rates. We have the weapons and ammunition to make this possible. If we did not, more lives would be lost. We program the expenditure of 1 billion rounds per year of small-arms ammunition, for instance, and 1,700,000 bombs.

Third. We have been building up our conventional forces substantially since 1961. For example:

First. We have added \$50 billion to the defense program since 1960 for this purpose.

Second. We had achieved a 100-percent increase in airlift capability.

Third. The number of combat-ready Army divisions has been increased 45 percent.

Fourth. The number of combat helicopters, upon which the mobility of our forces in Vietnam depends, has been increased 45 percent.

Fifth. The number of Air Force fighter squadrons has been increased 51 percent.

If the Congress and the Defense Department had not had the foresight to program these increases, we would in-

deed have had real supply problems and American lives would have been unnecessarily sacrificed.

So it is as a result of this policy, that the Members have supported, that we are as well prepared as we are for the war in which we find ourselves.

I should like to say this: The United States has been better prepared for and has acted more quickly and more efficiently to cope with the demands of this war than any other war in our entire history. This understanding is necessary to a proper perspective of the situation.

We hear allegations of shortages and inefficiencies. There are some shortages and inefficiencies which should surprise no one in an effort this large. But the overall picture as to military strength and readiness is amazingly good. We have every reason to be proud of our men, and not only of our men but of the equipment which has been provided by the foresight of the Government in recent years.

I say that for all of the administrations involved. No shortage of equipment or supplies has adversely affected the conduct of the war insofar as our hearings have been able to determine.

There is every indication that our forces in Vietnam are being well led. General Westmoreland seems to have the complete confidence of military and civilian leaders in the executive branch of the Government, and this, of course, includes the President.

General Westmoreland also seems to have the full confidence of the Members of Congress who have made on-the-spot checks of the situation in southeast Asia. The bravery of our troops and their morale is without question. We have every reason to be proud of the performance of the Nation as a whole in this time of difficulty and trial.

There seems to be little reason to argue about the amount of money requested in this bill. We are going to need all of these funds. We have spent 24 days in hearings in the Committee on Appropriations already this year exploring our military requirements for funds. One cannot separate this supplemental from the fiscal 1967 regular budget for defense. We have had Secretary McNamara before our committee on defense requirements of the Nation a total of 5 days, and we have had many other witnesses, also. We have been giving consideration to this matter, and properly so, since the beginning of the session. We will continue to do so, and we hope that in a couple of months we can bring the new bill before you. However, certainly, for the moment, we should support this legislation and provide the equipment, the clothing, the ammunition, and the other things that are needed now.

In this bill before us we provide for 2,005 additional helicopters which are very much needed in the type of war that we are fighting. We are providing for the procurement of 906 fixed-wing aircraft. We are providing the huge sum of \$2,078 million for munitions, weapons of war, and associated equipment. So it is very evident to me that this is an important and necessary installment for

the active prosecution of the war in Vietnam.

Briefly, the bill provides—

U.S. military.....	\$12,345,719,600
Military assistance to South Vietnam.....	375,000,000
Economic assistance to South Vietnam.....	415,000,000
Total.....	13,135,719,000

Funds for about 113,000 more military personnel than already approved for fiscal year 1966.

An additional \$2,316,269,000 for operation and maintenance to provide generally for the increased tempo of operations.

For procurement:

Aircraft.....	\$3,212,400,000
Missiles.....	181,400,000
Munitions.....	2,078,000,000
Other procurement such as electronic and communications equipment.....	1,547,600,000
Total.....	7,019,400,000

For research and development effort on weapons and equipment directly required in southeast Asia, \$151,650,000.

For military construction in support of operational requirements in Vietnam, \$1,238,400,000. The actual construction projects, although primarily located in Vietnam, are also located in the United States and in other countries such as the Philippines.

When we vote for this bill I think we will show to the Nation and to the entire world that the elected representatives of the people stand firmly together in resisting any program of appeasement or of vacillation and are supporting a program of unyielding opposition to aggression. By our action in supporting this bill we put the country and the world on notice that we feel that we in this country have a vital stake in the outcome of the war in Vietnam. It is true that we want to be helpful to the Vietnamese, but we are not spending all of these billions of dollars and the lives of our men only to be helpful to the Vietnamese. We are trying to obtain peace in the world, which happens to be very important to the welfare of all humanity.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California, the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations on the minority side [Mr. LIPSCOMB].

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today, H.R. 13546, provides supplemental defense funds for the fiscal year 1966 budget totaling \$13,135,719,000 in new obligatory authority as requested by the President for military functions and military and economic assistance to support our operations in southeast Asia.

This measure is of vital importance to our security and welfare for the United States must remain ready and able to act in the national interest and to support such action fully.

As approved by the Appropriations Committee, the Department of Defense portions of the bill, which total \$12,345,719,000, provide for the following:

March 15, 1966

For military personnel, the bill provides \$1,620 million which will support, in addition to that previously approved, a net increase of approximately 113,000 military personnel and certain additions to the Army National Guard and other Reserve components.

In the area of operation and maintenance, the bill proposes an appropriation of \$2,316,269,000.

For procurement of military supplies, the bill includes \$7,019,400,000. Broadly speaking, this includes funding for ammunition, various types of rotary and fixed wing aircraft, various types of vehicles, electronic and communication equipment, and for other items such as ships, spare parts, clothing and other consumables. In some cases the stocks are exhausted or are dangerously low, and these funds are needed to replenish the supply.

For research, development, test, and evaluation the supplemental request provides \$151,650,000, much of which will be devoted to special needs generated by the Vietnam war. This includes such programs as an increase in medical research to provide new drugs to combat a severe strain of drug resistant malaria, for work in developing aircraft suppressive fire systems, helicopter modification, developing a fast deployment logistic ship—FDL—and to speed up development of advanced radar techniques for surveillance purposes, and to modify aircraft to increase their effectiveness in their close air support missions in a southeast Asia environment.

Military construction funds in the bill total \$1,238,400,000. This is for construction projects both in the continental United States and in the southeast Asia area at bases, airfields, ports, and related facilities.

Also the bill includes \$375 million relating to military assistance and \$415 million for the Agency for International Development for economic assistance in Vietnam.

COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 13546. There should be no question in anyone's mind about the necessity of providing completely ample funds to support our commitment in Vietnam and related areas. Nor should there be any reservation about the need to supply our American boys fighting over there with the necessary arms, ammunition, and other requirements. Prompt passage of this measure would also illustrate to our fighting men, our citizens, and our enemies that we are willing and able to take the steps that are necessary to back up our country's commitment to insure freedom in South Vietnam and prevent the further expansion of communism.

At the same time, I believe that additional comments on this measure and the defense picture generally are necessary.

The escalation of the conflict in Vietnam intensified in February of last year. But even in view of the worsening Vietnam situation last year the fiscal year 1966 defense budget originally submitted to Congress was tight," as described by Department of Defense witnesses before our subcommittee. No amendment to the fiscal year 1966 original request for

additional funds was made by the administration to support the increased activity in southeast Asia during the time the House Appropriation Subcommittee on Defense held several months of hearings and the bill was taken up and passed by the House in June. The only action taken, which amounted in large part to a token gesture as far as the amount of funds was concerned, was the supplemental request for fiscal year 1965 for a \$700 million emergency fund for southeast Asia, approved by the Congress last May.

Because of this fact and our deep concern that there must be adequate, timely funding for the defense program, two other members of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and I felt compelled to make the following statement in additional views in the committee report last June on the regular fiscal year 1966 budget as submitted to the House:

It is our firm belief that appropriations must be sufficient to carry out successfully U.S. commitments anywhere in the world.

American personnel in Vietnam must be equipped and supported in such a degree as will give maximum assurance of safety and a capability to carry out their duties. We believe the President should immediately revise this fiscal year 1966 defense budget with a view toward requesting the Congress to provide for the unplanned and unprogramed expenditures which have resulted from his decision to assume a greater role in southeast Asia (H. Rept. No. 528, 89th Cong., 1st sess., p. 63).

Despite repeated urgings such as this, no change in the original fiscal year 1966 budget request was received until August of last year, almost 7 months after the increased action in Vietnam. Then, the request was made for a \$1.7 billion southeast Asia emergency fund add-on which was amended into the House version of the defense bill by the Senate. Even then, this added amount covered only a fraction of the needs, to start increasing production rates and construction projects, and some other items that were critically needed. It was too obvious not to be widely recognized at the time that the \$1.7 billion amendment did little more than begin to provide the funds needed.

The \$12.3 billion supplemental request we are considering today for Department of Defense, military functions, was presented to Congress in January, only several months later. We were told by witnesses who appeared to testify for the \$12.3 billion defense portion of the supplemental bill that the needs were not precisely known before this time. It is, of course, understood that our needs in situations such as this cannot be identified precisely. As a matter of fact it is clear from the testimony that the needs are still not precisely known. But from the evidence on hand it seems clear also that had the budget request been submitted earlier, it could have prevented extensive budgetary manipulations that have been going on within the Department of Defense.

DEFICIENCIES IN BUDGETING AND PLANNING

Let me illustrate some of the results of this type of budgeting and planning in the defense program.

The Secretary of Defense has used all of the discretionary funds he had avail-

able in the construction program for Vietnam. He has virtually exhausted research and development emergency funds. In addition there has been extensive use of his transfer authority and reprogramming of funds to meet critical needs.

As a matter of fact it was brought out in the testimony that this bill would have to be approved by approximately March 1, which of course passed 2 weeks ago, to prevent further budgetary maneuvering and the use of emergency actions.

Secretary McNamara himself stated that if the funds were not provided by March 1:

We might have to take certain emergency actions to keep on schedule and those actions would not make for as orderly an operation and as efficient an operation as we would have if the bill is enacted by March 1.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

In the area of military personnel, for the first time funds for military personnel have been requested and are in this budget covering the escalation of activity. Also, for the first time the matter of combat pay for our men in southeast Asia is adequately covered since the escalation of activity. The Department of Defense up until this time has been handling the increased regular personnel and combat pay requirements by using up available personnel funds. This is just no way to budget and to handle financing for the pay of our military personnel.

This supplemental does not even include funds to take care of military pay increases approved last year. The Department of Defense has submitted still another separate supplemental request for this purpose as part of a Government-wide bill. That request, for an additional \$863 million, was submitted to Congress March 8, 1966. Serious difficulties meeting personnel expenses can be expected if the supplemental pay request is not approved soon.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Though the Vietnam escalation began last February, this bill provides the first appropriation for operation and maintenance for fiscal year 1966 funds to reflect our increased needs in southeast Asia. Operation and maintenance includes such critical items as fuel, logistical and operational support, and medical support to all the services. The fiscal year 1966 budget, including the \$1.7 billion add-on for southeast Asia, which was signed into law last September did not include such funds. Increased requirements in this area have been handled by the Department of Defense by shifting of funds to meet emergency needs.

PROCUREMENT

Procurement for vital military equipment such as aircraft, weapons, vehicles, and ammunition at more than \$7 billion makes up the major portion of this supplemental request.

Analysis of this item reveals that a portion of the request is for replenishment of war reserve stocks. This need, in my view, should have been recognized many months earlier, for our stock levels were and are known and it should be readily recognized that any escalation would dip further into the stockpiles.

After the various branches of service submitted their individual requests to the Department of Defense for the original fiscal year 1966 budget, numerous cuts were made by the Secretary. This action is expected and generally is neither unusual nor objectionable. However, it does become a matter of concern when a budget is presented which should and could more adequately have anticipated critical developments. This bill, and to some extent the August 1965 \$1.7 billion amendment, contain some of the very items which were cut last year by the Secretary of Defense from the services' request for fiscal year 1966 in such areas as aircraft, spares, repair parts, and support material, all vital to the conduct of the war.

Now we come to a situation almost completely opposite to the examples I have been discussing. While it is necessary to have funds required for our defense program requested and approved in a timely manner, it is equally true that responsible budgeting requires that money requests be considered in orderly schedules commensurate with our needs at the time and not swept through in supplemental bills.

Some of the items that properly should be included in the regular defense budget for fiscal year 1967 which will come up later in the session have been injected into this supplemental. A number of items amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars were deleted by the Office of the Secretary of Defense from the fiscal year 1967 regular budget request by the service branches and moved into the supplemental request that we are discussing today.

Additionally when it is realized that this \$12.3 billion defense supplemental request is for fiscal year 1966 which has less than 4 months to go, other questions must be raised. For example, considering the long leadtime needed to start up production or to increase production rates, this, coupled with the large quantities involved, indicates that a portion of the procurement funds could have been included in the regular fiscal year 1967 budget request. Sufficient funds could have been included in this supplemental request to accelerate the production rate for long lead parts and tooling and fund production items to carry through the 4-month period. Such a procedure would have had the effect of moving many millions of dollars into the fiscal year 1967 budget with no ill effects upon scheduled deliveries.

This is the type of budgeting taking place in such a crucial area as procurement. One could come to the conclusion that this has been done in an effort to make the regular 1967 budget look lower.

The picture is further clouded by the fact that items are to be procured to fill needed requirements as a result of attrition which occurred during the previous 3- to 4-year period.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

With regard to the request for supplemental appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation, it has been said repeatedly that our planning was aimed at enabling us to pursue the type of conflict as is going on in Vietnam

in an expeditious manner. Yet it took an escalated activity in Vietnam to produce a fund request to support a level of effort needed to make these new findings and weapons available quickly. Though we can hopefully say that these funds should provide a measure of improvement, some other research and development programs are being funded at a level of effort lower than a realistic assessment of the overall threat would indicate they should be.

LANGUAGE CHANGE

This supplemental package includes equal to accounts payable. The new guage change contained in section 101 of the bill with regard to the working capital funds, known as stock funds. The language change will eliminate the requirement to maintain cash balances equal to accounts payable. The new language provides for transfer between funds and states that balances "may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds." If this change of language had not been proposed by the Secretary of Defense in this bill, it would have been necessary for the Secretary to ask for another \$350 to \$500 million.

From an accounting standpoint and based on the brief look the subcommittee had of this item, it appears to be a reasonable proposal. However, because there was not time to completely evaluate it, the committee is requiring the Department of Defense to provide quarterly reports giving the financial status of each working capital fund, including information as to any adjustments that have been made as between the working capital funds. Congress must keep close watch on this item and take appropriate action if it is found that this procedure is not working properly.

CONCLUSIONS

Our men in Vietnam are serving bravely and with great distinction. They are fighting to preserve and advance freedom in the world against Communist aggression. Based on my observations in Vietnam last fall and from testimony in the hearing, their morale is high, their motivation strong. They are there to win.

Such practices as I have described here in my view are neither good management nor do they reflect the maximum in effective planning which is so necessary to insure that the men and material will be where they are needed in a manner which will afford our servicemen worldwide the ability to perform their mission and receive the maximum protection for their safety.

The result has been patchwork defense budgeting in many respects, which is both unfitting of our great Nation and not in keeping with the seriousness and importance of the Vietnam effort.

Congress should be concerned for the available evidence suggests efforts to reduce congressional control over the defense budget. It suggests that better defense planning and management could be done. Congress should be disturbed because the evidence also suggests that the decisions as to when budgetary requests are to be submitted and how much

each of these should contain are not necessarily determined solely by our military requirements, but that arbitrarily shifting and juggling is done to influence, impress, or convince the public, depending on what is considered most needed at any particular time.

A lack of effective planning could undermine not only our effort in Vietnam but weaken our national security as a whole. We live in dangerous times that warrant the utmost vigilance and preparedness. The threat to Vietnam is not an isolated incident, and therefore we cannot blind ourselves to problem areas in the rest of the world, now or in the future.

I strongly urge the administration to review our overall defense posture and policies, with a broad view of our commitments, not just Vietnam. Because of the effect the conflict in Vietnam has had upon our defense structure there is a need for such a review immediately. I feel confident that Congress will assist in any way it can in such a review and provide the necessary authority for any legitimate increases or modifications that appear to be warranted. In this regard, Congress must receive the full benefit of military judgment without constraints. Congress must have frank discussions by both the civilian and military members of the Department of Defense in order to reach objective judgments and carry out its constitutional mandate responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill to provide additional funds for southeast Asia. I felt it was necessary, however, to comment today in some detail on the bill and I also respectfully call attention to the additional views contained in the report calling for improved fiscal procedures. It is my hope that the views expressed receive full consideration by the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am very happy to note that there is genuine bipartisan support for this appropriation measure. I, of course, support this bill.

Joining 39 Governors, I support the President on Vietnam. The \$13.1 billion fund is essential for the support of our troops and for carrying out our commitments in South Vietnam.

The direction of policy in this conflict is far from easy. It bristles with serious and awesome problems.

The President must make the final decisions. He has his intimate advisers, yet he is like a lonely man atop a mountain.

Many are his sleepless nights, especially when he reads the tragic dispatches. At times he is veritably torn asunder with doubts and fears. But courage and stamina are not lacking. He knows that patience is bitter but bears rich fruit.

Like all who are responsible and dedicated, he is not insensible to criticism. He welcomes it when it is not mordant or abusive. Some of his frenetic critics seem more interested in crushing him than in our triumph against aggression in South Vietnam.

March 15, 1966

I do not deprecate—nay, I would encourage debate on this momentous topic of Vietnam. Only on the anvil of debate may we forge the truth.

But some of the attacks are below the belt. Some are mere billingsgate. With the monotony of a drumbeat we hear some of these armchair strategists and "pinafore" admirals saying what should be done. Ofttimes they speak in pique and spite. For them whatever the President does is wrong.

Some ranted that he should have gone to the United Nations. Although he was told by his trusted advisers that such action would be futile, he nonetheless made the trek to the United Nations. When he did that the same detractors railed that such a move was ridiculous and bound to fail.

These same carping critics ridiculed his efforts at peace and said he sought peace only halfheartedly. "Let him appeal to the Pope at Rome." He did. When his Holiness offered all in his power and did not succeed in budging Hanoi or Peiping, these same habitual faultfinders said, "I told you so."

President Johnson made direct appeals to 19 nonaligned nations with a view to having them persuade Hanoi and Peiping to the conference table. These nations did, but were rebuffed.

The President sought particularly India's intercession. The rulers of Hanoi and Peiping again showed their fangs.

The President, you may remember, was savagely condemned for continued bombing of the north. He ordered the bombing stopped. The cessation yielded serious military disadvantage to us. The President received no credit for his efforts. The Vietcong were brought no nearer to the conference table.

The President requested Soviet Russia to arrange another Geneva-like conference. Russia demurred. Ho Chi Minh and Mao Tse-tung just turn their faces away from all who bring the olive branch of peace. Only yesterday, our offer of friendship, conveyed by Vice President HUMPHREY, was branded as the "kiss of Judas."

Yet, the incensed defamers of the President continue to vent their spleen against him. Never do they utter a good word for anything he may do. They dip their pens in venom or gargle with gall, and write or speak "grapes of wrath."

They refuse to realize the results of their incautious remarks, fail to understand that they create the false impression abroad, that our Nation does not support the President. Nothing is further from the truth.

I raise my voice in clarion tones to defend and applaud my President, and at the same time support this appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for his statement. I think it is apropos, timely, forceful, and to the point. I especially like what he said about the armchair strategists and the Pinafore admirals, because, as Sir Winston Churchill once said,

"It is very easy indeed to make plans to win a war if you have no responsibility for carrying them out."

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, who conducted some of the hearings on this bill.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, let me stress the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has been ready to bring this bill to the floor for several weeks. Under the able direction of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, hearings were initiated immediately after the request for funds for the Vietnam war was received. There is no disposition to withhold any funds which are needed to insure victory. And ours is a bipartisan effort. This is in some measure a guess. But it is the best estimate which is available. We have to trust someone. We are placing our trust in the recommendations of the Nation's military leaders.

Now the gentleman from Texas has spoken at length about the state of readiness of our military forces when the confrontation began and it is in fact a remarkable and commendable situation. But let us not disregard the continued efforts of district leaders in the Congress like the gentleman from Texas and many others to make this situation true.

I regret to state to the membership that those who attempt to read the hearings, will find them in considerable part useless. The testimony has been so heavily censored, much of it incomprehensible. Some of this is ridiculous. It serves only to confuse the Congress and the American people. Some of the censored material has subsequently been released in uncensored form by other committees, or even by Pentagon officials. This makes a mockery of the efforts of this committee to cooperate on security matters.

Now let us talk about the bill. I shall confine myself primarily to the construction problem on which separate hearings were held. As the House knows, the logistics problem in the Southeast Pacific is unbelievably large. Logistics is and has been the limiting factor. We are supplying large forces, 12,000 miles away from home, halfway around the world.

Last fall the U.S. forces were built up to more than 200,000. This was necessary to stem the tide of victory which was rolling for Communist forces. They nearly won the war before we realized and acted on the threat.

But it was also thought that we were putting enough forces into Vietnam to permit government forces to win. We underestimated enemy capabilities. They were building up too—men and equipment. The Ho Chi Minh trail was improved and developed into a road system capable of delivering large quantities of supplies. Food was no problem. The Communists were living off the Vietnam rice crop and they still are, because they hold most of the countryside.

To win a war you must be prepared to deny territory to the enemy. The victorious sweep of United States and Vietnamese forces into enemy held countryside are in most instances, followed by withdrawal to secure areas, and the Communists roll right back as we leave.

To insure the defeat of expanding enemy forces and to secure and hold territory now in Communist hands, we must have additional forces in Vietnam. We are now in the process of doubling their number.

That means doubling the logistics problem. We need port facilities, airfields, encampments, storage facilities. In December, when I saw the area work on some of the facilities then needed for 200,000 men, had not begun. On others, the percentage of completion was extremely small. The overall job is running a year behind schedule. This is not the fault of the construction team. They are doing an outstanding job. The enormity of their task is the main problem and it is staggering in scope. Let us not take away credit for the work which has been done.

The construction of essential operational, logistical, and support facilities are a pacing factor in the deployment of allied forces and the conduct of military operations in southeast Asia. The nature of the terrain, the paucity of operational bases and the lack of national ports and other supply and logistical facilities in that area have resulted in a major construction effort if we are to adequately support our military requirements. In addition, backup and training requirements have generated other urgent construction needs in other areas of the Pacific and in the United States. The amount of \$417,700,000 has been made available to date in support of this program. Additional funds in the total amount of \$1,238,400,000 are recommended in the accompanying bill. This brings the total to date to \$1,656,100,000 for construction.

This is broken down as follows:

Appropriations in support of southeast Asia to date
[In millions]

Country	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Vietnam.....	\$115.2	\$78.2	\$77.6	\$271.0
Philippines.....		21.4	7.7	29.1
Guam.....		.5	1.6	2.1
Wake.....			.7	.7
United States.....	7.0			7.0
Various.....	40.0	17.6	50.3	107.8
Total.....	162.2	117.6	137.9	417.7

Recommended in accompanying bill—Program
[In millions]

Country	Army	Navy	Air Force	Total
Vietnam.....	\$407.5	\$207.1	\$128.0	\$742.6
Philippines.....		28.2	9.0	37.2
Guam.....		5.7	8.0	13.7
United States.....	34.1	24.3	5.0	63.4
Other.....	138.3	24.4	174.1	336.8
Planning.....	29.8	14.9	(1)	44.7
Total.....	609.7	304.6	324.1	1,238.4

¹ Distributed by country.

Appropriation [In millions]	
Army-----	\$509.7
Navy-----	254.6
Air Force-----	274.1
Defense emergency fund-----	200.0
Total-----	1,238.4
Appropriations and recommendations to date	
SUMMARY [In millions]	
Army-----	\$671.9
Navy-----	372.2
Air Force-----	412.0
Defense emergency fund-----	200.0
Total-----	1,656.1

In the past, there has been a serious lack of central authority and coordination in the construction efforts. Effective coordination between the construction and operational programs has been limited. The recent establishment of a general officer position on the staff of the Military Advisory Command in Vietnam to effectuate this coordination should assist in overcoming the problem. But vigorous efforts still must be made to properly coordinate the construction effort and make it fully responsive to operational requirements.

An essential portion of the construction problem is the lack of sufficient skilled labor forces in South Vietnam to meet the military construction effort which is needed. The present contractor effort is requiring all of the available local labor force plus generating a requirement for the use of foreign labor which naturally adds to the cost. The construction battalions of the Navy and the Army are doing heroic work in their activities there. There is one of the outstanding contributions. If the escalated construction program is to be successfully implemented, there is a need for more troop construction battalions from both the Navy and the Army. The requirement for these troops will be accentuated as additional facilities become operational and it becomes necessary to maintain them with troop labor. In order to meet the overall requirement for the construction and maintenance of facilities, steps now are being taken to double the troop construction units in South Vietnam. However, this is not enough. Through the use of only a part of the Reserve Engineer Construction Battalions and Navy Seabee Battalions—for which equipment is available—the number of these forces in the southeast Pacific could be doubled again. To do this would save lives and time and money. This is one of the most important steps which could be taken, but there are no indications it is going to be done.

Now, this is a costly program. This is not the end of it.

It is no time to get careless on costs, and there always is the temptation to do so when money is readily available in unlimited amounts from Congress. It is the attitude of Congress that America's fighting men must have whatever they need to fight a war. But this is not an invitation for the Pentagon to spend recklessly or wastefully. I am very much afraid that time will reveal that

there is waste and reckless spending in some instances. I give you one illustration which applies to the bill as a whole. The Army has contracted to buy a light observation helicopter in considerable numbers for \$19,000 each per airframe. But in the program before you the Army proposes to buy the same helicopter with slight changes from the same manufacturer for \$47,000 each. The Army does not even seek to take full advantage of an option to buy additional helicopters at the contract price of \$19,000. A competing firm with a helicopter which is essentially the same recently offered to provide helicopters at \$29,800 each. I am convinced that today there are a number of firms which would welcome an opportunity to provide helicopters at a figure much lower than \$47,000. This is an inexcusable situation. Here is a place where heads should roll. And there may well be other instances. The Pentagon should launch its own investigations to determine that the specter of waste and careless purchasing does not belie the sacrifices of those who serve on the fighting front. I can tell you that this committee, through its chairman, has notified the Pentagon of our strong concern about the case in point.

The Committee still is deeply concerned that the programed expanded labor force and improved construction capability will be insufficient to meet the construction requirements. Continuing effort must be made to provide the construction capability in South Vietnam necessary to support operational and logistical requirements. To do less would seriously jeopardize the efforts of our military forces are making to achieve the victory and peace desired by this Nation.

There also is a tendency to utilize peacetime financial and programing procedures in the military construction program in South Vietnam. Steps have recently been taken to broaden these procedures so as to provide additional flexibility in the program. The Committee is concerned that these changes might not be sufficient to meet the requirements for the proper implementation of the program. It will be expected that the Department of Defense will continually examine this phase of the program to insure that the necessary flexibility is provided within the overall construction program to meet changing tactical and logistical requirements and to provide a responsive and progressive program.

There has been a turn for the better in the fighting in Vietnam. The Saigon government shows more stability than at any time since the Diem regime. There is now recognition of the necessity to face up to the problem of winning over the people of the villages and hamlets—many of whom have been Communist-dominated for years.

These things may well give rise to a feeling at home that the problem of Vietnam has essentially been solved—that victory is near. This would be dangerous thinking indeed. The biggest casualty lists of the war are coming in now. We have far to go. We must never forget we are in a war—a dirty, dangerous war which soon will involve

nearly half a million American fighting men. They must have the solid backing of the American people and the Congress.

It also is a time for soul searching efforts in the Pentagon to insure that the right decisions are being made. There is no time to hold back the forces or the methods which can help to insure an early victory.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently, a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 37]

Adair	Ellsworth	Mosher
Baring	Everett	Pool
Bell	Fraser	Powell
Boiling	Fuqua	Reinecke
Brock	Hagen, Calif.	Roncaglio
Brown, Calif.	Halleck	Roudebush
Clawson, Del.	Harvey, Ind.	Sisk
Collier	Holfield	Steed
Conyers	Howard	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	McCarthy	Toll
Derwinski	Martin, Ala.	Walker, Miss.
Devine	Martin, Nebr.	Willis
Dowdy	Mathias	
Downing	Matthews	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having assumed the Chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 13546, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 391 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has 54 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] has 1 hour and 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the defense appropriation subcommittee report on this supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 in the amount of \$13.1 billion.

The support of those of us on the minority side of the Committee on Appropriations for this bill is predicated on the necessity and the awareness that these funds must be provided in order to back up our fighting men in Vietnam.

I would like to point out to the Members of the House, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the last supplemental appropriation that we will be considering for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966. Submitted to the Congress under a transmittal that came up here entitled District of Columbia supplemental appropriations for 1966, just the other day, there is contained almost another billion dollars in appropriation requests for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1966 to handle military pay alone.

Those of us on the minority side of the House back when the defense appropriation

March 15, 1966

tion bill for 1966 was before the Congress pointed out that no funds were included in the 1966 budget statement last January to cover the cost of escalating the war in Vietnam.

I would like to say today that although this supplemental is before us today, this coupled with the 1967 budget for the Department of Defense will not finance current plans and contingencies for the fighting in Vietnam through the remaining portion of the fiscal year 1966 and the fiscal year 1967.

As the chairman of our committee so ably said, this supplemental has to be considered along with the 1967 budget for the Department of Defense. It should be pointed out here on the floor of the House today that the 1967 budget was out of date 2 days after it was submitted to this Congress. It was out of date because the manpower ceiling so far as the Department of the Army is concerned was removed 2 days after the budget was submitted to the Congress by the President of the United States.

Those of us working with the Department of Defense budgets know full well that additional funds will be needed in 1966 as well as in 1967 in order to finance the commitment of the United States not only in Vietnam, but to maintain our present worldwide commitments supported by this administration which were so ably set forth by the Secretary of State in his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate just 10 days ago.

Mr. Chairman, on March 4, 1966, the Department of State issued through the office of its legal adviser an important document entitled, "The Legality of U.S. Participation in the Defense of Vietnam."

The document was prepared to combat the persistent criticism from certain Democratic Members of the Congress that this Nation is acting illegally in using American military power in Vietnam.

With the major thesis of this document, I have no quarrel. A compelling case for the right of the United States under international law to use its military forces to assist in the defense of South Vietnam against aggression can certainly be made.

I am grieved, however, to find that the State Department chose to distort history in this publication when it came to explain the commitments which have resulted in the involvement of the United States in the war in Vietnam. The distortion is of two kinds. First, the document ignores completely some highly relevant facts. Second, it misleads by failing to analyze fully the declarations which it cites, sometimes conveying thereby a false impression of their import.

In summary, this document argues that the present military involvement of the Nation in Vietnam was made necessary by pledges made by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. It does not cite a single utterance by President Johnson. It suggests that the present administration had nothing at all to do with any commitment to Vietnam.

This document contains a section of 6 pages headed, "The United States Has Undertaken Commitments To Assist South Vietnam in Defending Itself Against Communist Aggression from the North." The evidence which it then presents to prove the existence of the commitment of the Eisenhower administration is the following: the statements of President Eisenhower at the end of the Geneva Conference of 1954, the SEATO treaty, the assistance given by the United States to South Vietnam after the Geneva Conference, and a joint communique issued by Eisenhower and Diem on May 11, 1957. This is followed by a citation of two statements made by President Kennedy on August 2, 1961, and December 14, 1961.

Then, abruptly, the State Department's history of the commitment of the United States to South Vietnam ends.

Equally strange is the section of this document captioned, "Actions by the United States and South Vietnam Are Justified Under the Geneva Accords of 1954." The actions of the United States which are described in this section are the supply of "considerable military equipment and supplies from the United States prior to late 1961" and the establishment of an American Military Assistance Advisory Group of "slightly less than 900 men" in Saigon. Further the document relates:

The United States found it necessary in late 1961 to increase substantially the numbers of our military personnel and the amounts and kinds of equipment introduced . . . into South Vietnam.

And there, abruptly, the State Department ends its account of the military action of the United States in South Vietnam.

If some future catastrophe were to destroy every written record of the relations of the United States and Vietnam during the 1950's and 1960's except the State Department's publication, "The Legality of United States Participation in the Defense of Vietnam," the historian who tried to reconstruct the facts from this document would write something like this:

Two Presidents of the United States—Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy—involved their Nation in a war to defend South Vietnam against aggression from North Vietnam. Their pledges of support to South Vietnam led to the sending of military supplies, to the dispatch of 900 military advisers, and in 1961 to the commitment of substantial numbers of American troops.

This conflict may have been going on in Vietnam as late as 1966 under another President of the United States whose name is not recorded. In that year the Department of State issued a document upholding the legality of the actions of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy.

Mr. Chairman, this manipulation of history should give us all deep concern. When our Department of State releases a report of this kind, I fear we are closer to 1984 than the calendar indicates. This is the kind of propaganda that makes it difficult for the administration to establish its credibility. This is playing politics with Vietnam.

NO COMMITMENT OF COMBAT TROOPS UNDER EISENHOWER

If the State Department document of March 4 were the only instance of distortion of history on the part of the administration in explaining why American troops are fighting in Vietnam, it might be forgotten. But time after time, administration spokesmen, including the President, have sought to make it appear that the steps taken since November of 1963 were forced upon it by commitments of earlier administrations.

President Johnson, for example, said on August 3, 1965:

Today the most difficult problem that confronts your President is how to keep an agreement that I did not initiate—I inherited it—but an agreement to help a small nation remain independent, free of aggression—the nation of South Vietnam.

Earlier the President and others in his administration were in the habit of citing a letter written by President Eisenhower to Diem on October 1, 1954, as "the commitment." This letter was nothing more than an expression of willingness to discuss ways and means of aiding Vietnam if the Diem regime made certain reforms.

More recently, the administration has been using the SEATO treaty of 1954 as the source of the commitment.

This treaty was not a commitment to send American troops to fight in southeast Asia. It carefully avoided the kind of automatic response to aggression embodied in the NATO agreement, summarized in the principle, "An attack upon one is an attack upon all."

Section 1 of article IV of the SEATO agreement reads:

1. Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. Measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations.

Secretary Dulles, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the SEATO treaty, declared:

The agreement of each of the parties to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes leaves to the judgment of each country the type of action to be taken in the event an armed attack occurs.

Further, Mr. Dulles said:

The treaty does not attempt to get into the difficult question as to precisely how we act.

On the floor of the Senate in the debate on ratification of the SEATO agreement, on February 1, 1955, Senator Smith, of New Jersey, clearly explained the nature of the commitment in these words:

Some of the participants came to Manila with the intention of establishing an organization modeled on the lines of the North Atlantic Treaty arrangements. That would have been a compulsory arrangement for our military participation in case of any attack. Such an organization might have required

the commitment of American ground forces to the Asian mainland. We carefully avoided any possible implication regarding an arrangement of that kind.

We have no purpose of following any such policy as that of having our forces involved in a ground war.

Under this treaty, each party recognizes that an armed attack on any country within the treaty area would endanger its own peace and safety. Each party, therefore, agrees to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. That means, by implication, that if any such emergency as is contemplated by the treaty should arise in that area it will be brought before the Congress by the President and the administration, and will be considered under our constitutional processes. We are not committed to the principle of NATO, namely, that an attack on one is an attack on all, calling for immediate military action without further consideration by Congress.

For ourselves, the arrangement means that we will have avoided the impracticable overcommitment which would have been involved if we attempted to place American ground forces around the perimeter of the area of potential Chinese ingress into southeast Asia. Nothing in this treaty calls for the use of American ground forces in that fashion.

The speaker, Senator H. Alexander Smith, was a member of the U.S. delegation to the Manila Conference and a signer of the SEATO agreement.

One academic authority, W. McMahon Ball, has written:

The treaty does not oblige the United States either legally or morally to take any course in southeast Asia than the course it might be expected to take if the treaty did not exist.

Article IV of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty clearly reserves to each signatory the right to determine the nature of its response to armed aggression and does not commit in advance any signatory to use its armed forces to deal with the aggressor.

Recognizing this fact, the Kennedy administration did not use American forces to repel Communist aggression in Laos.

The legal commitment of the United States to South Vietnam is the same as its commitment to Laos. Both of these countries of southeast Asia were brought under the protection of SEATO.

Lyndon Johnson as Vice President made it clear in 1961 that the United States had not up to that time committed itself to an obligation that would require employment of its military forces. In a memorandum to President Kennedy dated May 23, 1961, right after his return from a tour of Asia, Johnson wrote:

The fundamental decision required of the United States—and time is of the greatest importance—is whether we are to attempt to meet the challenge of Communist expansion now in southeast Asia by a major effort in support of the forces of freedom in the area or throw in the towel. This decision must be made in a full realization of the very heavy and continuing costs involved in terms of money, of effort, and of U.S. prestige. It must be made with the knowledge that at some point we may be faced with a further decision of whether we commit major U.S. forces to the area or cut our losses and withdraw should our efforts fail. We must remain master of this decision.

Finally, Gen. Maxwell Taylor in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 17, 1966, demolished the argument that there was any commitment to employ American troops in combat under the Eisenhower administration in the following exchange with Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER of Iowa:

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Now, up until the end of the Eisenhower administration, we had only about 750 military personnel in South Vietnam, did we not?

General TAYLOR. It was very small, something like that.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. I think that is within 25 or 30 of the number, either way, and they were entirely devoted to giving technical advice on training to the South Vietnamese troops.

General TAYLOR. That is correct.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. To your knowledge, did we have any commitment or agreement with the South Vietnamese up to that time that we would put in active field military forces to conduct a war along with them?

General TAYLOR. No, sir. Very clearly we made no such commitment. We didn't want such a commitment. This was the last thing we had in mind.

Senator HICKENLOOPER. When was the commitment made for us to actively participate in the military operations of the war as American personnel?

General TAYLOR. We, insofar as the use of our combat ground forces are concerned, that took place, of course, only in the spring of 1965.

In the air, we had been participating more actively over 2 or 3 years.

When President Eisenhower left the White House, there were no American troops in South Vietnam. There were only approximately 700 military advisers. When President Eisenhower left the White House, there was no commitment to send American troops to South Vietnam.

Under President Kennedy, the first American combat casualties occurred in December 1961. Although President Kennedy increased the number of U.S. military personnel in Vietnam to 17,000, the American forces were there primarily to advise, not to fight.

The New York Times of August 19, 1965, correctly stated the case when it said:

The shift from military assistance and combat advice to direct participation by American combat troops in the Vietnamese war has * * * been a unilateral American decision * * * by President Johnson.

THE HONOLULU COMMITMENT

I find it unbelievable that a State Department document dated March 4, 1966, purporting to explain the commitment of this Nation in South Vietnam could avoid mention of the Honolulu declaration of February 8, 1966. For part IV of that declaration is entitled "The Common Commitment." It reads:

The President of the United States and the Chief of State and Prime Minister of the Republic of Vietnam are thus pledged again to defense against aggression, to the work of social revolution, to the goal of free self-government, to the attack on hunger, ignorance, and disease, and to the unending quest for peace.

These are important and weighty commitments. Yet they go unreported in the State Department's survey of the commitment of the Government of the United States to South Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean here to be critical of the actions of the President with relation to Vietnam. I simply plead that, when the administration undertakes to defend itself against critics in the President's party, it present the facts and all the facts. Let the administration acknowledge its decisions as its own and justify its actions on their merits.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] has made reference to the historical background of the war in Vietnam.

I believe that if a look backward reveals anything it reveals our difficulties in South Vietnam have been nonpartisan in nature. The actions which this country has taken have been actions taken in defense of the security of the United States and have not been motivated in my opinion by political considerations.

The war by the Vietnamese against the French began in 1946. In 1950 we began to give some assistance to the French in an effort to try to conclude successfully this war. The French finally capitulated. We began to provide aid to the South Vietnamese against aggression in Vietnam in 1950. In 1954 or 1955 we began to provide foreign aid, direct military and economic, to the people in Vietnam who were fighting for freedom.

Mr. Chairman, during this time a number of negotiations took place. Mr. Dulles was very instrumental as Secretary of State in negotiating the SEATO treaty. In this treaty, to which we subscribe, the United States undertook an international obligation to help defend South Vietnam against aggression.

The treaty said:

Each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement might hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with constitutional processes—

And so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

So, Mr. Chairman, we recognized early that the security and well-being of the United States was heavily involved in southeast Asia.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point in the treaty?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to discuss that point.

Mr. MAHON. I do not want to discuss it in detail, but I want to briefly refer to the history of this situation in

March 15, 1966

which we found ourselves and in which both our political parties and all administrations have stood out against aggression, and properly so, in southeast Asia.

Mr. LAIRD. If my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will yield to me, I would like to state that I am sure he agrees with me that the State Department document is not correct in its interpretation of our present commitment in Vietnam.

I would like to quote from the testimony of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles when he discussed this particular section to which the gentleman from Texas alludes at this point.

When Secretary Dulles testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on this particular section he declared:

The agreement of each of the parties to act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes leaves to the judgment of each country the type of action to be taken in the event an armed attack occurs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is quite different from the language which is included in the NATO agreement, when the NATO agreement comes out as an attack on one is an attack on all.

Mr. Chairman, I am placing in the RECORD a discussion of the definition that Secretary Dulles made very clearly between the SEATO and the NATO agreements.

The point of my remarks is not to question the SEATO agreement. It is to question the interpretation used by our State Department to justify military action in Vietnam today, on the basis of that treaty, because I believe that treaty is not the basis for justifying direct military action by one country in the treaty organization without consent of all countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

We, it is true, were not specifically committed by the treaty to send American troops to war. We all know that as a result of Communist aggression the situation in Vietnam has continued to worsen. The SEATO agreement is, of course, available for all to interpret. I do not undertake at the moment to get into the details of the treaty.

Now, in 1959 Mr. Eisenhower said—and correctly, in my judgment:

Unassisted Vietnam cannot at this time produce and support the military formations essential to it or, equally important, the morale—the hope, the confidence, the pride—necessary to meet the dual threat of aggression from without and subversion within its borders.

Strategically, South Vietnam's capture by the Communists would bring their power several hundred miles into a hitherto free region. The remaining countries in southeast Asia would be menaced by a great flanking movement. . . . The loss of South Vietnam would set in motion a crumbling process that could, as it progressed, have grave consequences for us and for freedom.

In the period 1953-57, during the Eisenhower administration—this Government provided \$1,100 million in aid to Vietnam in an effort to stop aggression. But this was only partially successful.

This aid continued throughout the Eisenhower administration and then under the Kennedy administration and continues under the Johnson administration. The problem finally culminated in this war which is being fought out of necessity, growing out of the commitments and the facts of life as they existed in 1950 and 1954 and ever since that time under all administrations.

This is not a partisan war. It is a war brought about by necessity to preserve the interests of the United States in southeast Asia.

We want to help the people in South Vietnam. That is true, but we also must look out after our own self-interests. The purpose of this bill today is to safeguard our own self-interests, the best interests of the United States.

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, first may I say that it has been my privilege to serve under the chairman of the full committee and of this subcommittee for many years. It has been my privilege to serve with other members of the subcommittee both on the minority and on the majority side. It has been my experience that never has there been a time throughout all these years when this country and this Congress could not look to these gentlemen to see that finances are provided to enable this Nation to meet its national defense needs in any military area, where we may have to exercise our might.

Certainly if we have erred through the years, it has been on the side of making absolutely certain that adequate funds are available. May I say that our hearings have always been full and in great detail. So that there will be no misunderstanding here, I would repeat again that you know and I know that all of us, without exception, will be supporting and defending our men in service whatever policy our Government decides upon in Vietnam.

I might say further, as I pointed out last year in our report, the matter of full funding of approved requests of the Defense Department has many weaknesses. But it has some advantages. Last year, for instance, as our committee reported, and as it exists today substantially, we have \$30 billion in unexpended funds to the credit of the Department of Defense. We had some \$9 billion not even obligated a year ago. All of that money would be subject to the decision of the Congress to be reappropriated, or to be simply transferred by the Department.

The point I make is that any planning and any actions that may have been taken by the Department of Defense have been for reasons other than that funds were not available, because they have been and are now available.

There is a substantial need for the bill that is before you, not because the money is not available if handled through channels, but this represents a projection of

the action expected to be taken by the Defense Department in connection with Vietnam for which we are making funds available in this bill.

Again, it is not because there is no money—it is because these projects, the acquisition of materiel and other actions, will cost money, and we are providing the money to do this job as we go along.

There are many causes. I have served on this committee most of the time since 1943, or at least one segment of it, and I think this matter of going into the cause, while it is academic in some respects, in many ways would be well insofar as deciding where we go from here. It is my personal view, and may I say the leaders on both sides of the aisle differed with me then and they differ with me now—but if I were to look for the cause, I would go back to the period after World War II when we went around the world telling practically every nation which would listen, "we will take care of you—we have the atomic bomb." We made those commitments in many places where, subsequently, it has become apparent we simply cannot carry out such promises, especially since others now have the atomic bomb.

Yes, if I were to look for the cause, I would remember that we went through a period when the Congress and the American public thought all we needed was the atomic bomb. To a great degree we quit producing conventional weapons and we reduced our efforts for maintenance of our defenses to the point where one of the top people in our Air Force said we were giving little training to our flyers in dropping ordinary bombs, because we had been lured into feeling we could drop a big bomb and that would be it. Unfortunately, today we are in the midst of a war; and we are using conventional weapons.

If I were to look further as to the responsibility, I would see that the leaders of both parties have followed a common foreign policy through the years right up until this moment.

If I looked at Cuba, I would realize there is enough fault to be found, looking backward, to include both parties and their leaders.

If I looked at many other areas, I would see somewhat the same situation.

A STALEMATE IS NO VICTORY

But what we have here, Mr. Chairman, is more serious than that. The question is, Where are we and what are we going to do about it? Here we are half way around the world, as my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] said, with a 10,000-mile supply line and engaged in battle in an area where human life means very little to the enemy, and where they can carry sufficient supplies for guerrilla warfare on their backs. We are engaged in a deadly conflict at the end of a 10,000-mile supply line. Both parties have followed policies which have ended in this situation, though I am sure no one intended it.

We find—and the record will support this—that Haiphong Harbor in North Vietnam is an open harbor. Through Haiphong Harbor 80 percent of the supplies being used by our enemy in South Vietnam are passing and, with the excep-

tion of several small countries, along with Communist nations our so-called friends are continuing to ship to our enemies through Haiphong Harbor.

Yes, if we carry the matter a little bit further, on the question of winning the war I agree we must win; but we must decide what it is to win. What does to win mean to us? To me it cannot be a maintenance of the status quo. Here is a little 100th-rated power, North Vietnam, pulling the biggest power in the world around by the nose day after day. It leads me, as an individual, to feel that the Vietcong may be winning as long as they can maintain the status quo and actually feel that they are. This we must stop and the first start, to me, appears to be to stop the inflow of materiel to our enemy.

We will supply this money. We argue about financial budgets. We want to keep waste down. We want to be economy minded in handling appropriations. But in World War II I well remember that when war materiel was sent to forward theaters, it was marked off then and there. That is not the major problem that we have. We are reconciled to the fact that these funds will be spent.

We are in an engagement at the end of a 10,000-mile supply line, with our troops slugging it out, fighting in swamps, attacked by mosquitoes and suffering from malaria; fighting under the most trying conditions where it seems we do not know who our friends are, but where our leaders feel we must remain to show that we will be in southeast Asia.

Speaking for myself alone, if we are to keep our young men there—and our leaders and our country feel not only a commitment but a present necessity to keep our forces there—we owe it to them to do those things that would cut off the supply line of their enemy, a supply line that to a great degree is fed by folks who are supposed to be our friends.

FOREIGN POLICY DETERIORATES

I repeat, the record will show that the only countries which have cut off shipping to North Vietnam are a relatively few minor ones. We are not stopping that shipping because we think these other countries might not give us the support we want in NATO or so I surmise. But look what has happened, already France has virtually announced her withdrawal from NATO. If you want to second-guess our policy in the last number of years, look at Africa. The men who had some know-how and brains to govern were forced out by us. It has drifted back to where the men with strength to run these little countries, the men we shoved out, have had to be returned for such order as they can effect.

We started on our present course a long time ago. If we look in every direction we can see the mortar cracking. We can see the high hopes of many of our people running out. We can see member nation's falling to put up their share in the United Nations.

But all of that is beside the point. We have young men fighting in a war that is as much a war to them as World War II, and we are here wondering whether we should do anything to cut off the supplies

of the opposition, supplies which are being transported by people supposedly on our side. To me the answer is, we must.

My friends, there is only one side to this appropriation bill. As I have said, the Defense Department has money that could have been used. They have money that they could now use. But we are financing the projection of contracts to supply material that it is apparent they are going to need.

There are two or three other things we might say. If we need a base in southeast Asia, might not we have the courage to say so and supply a base as against saying that we are trying to let people follow the path of their own determination, with all the mixed-up information that we can get on that subject?

I wish to say again that I am for this country, and I know the Members of the Congress are, too. I do feel an obligation, having questioned the Secretary of Defense and various others, and I shall put those questions and answers, where they exist, in the RECORD, to question present actions or lack of determination to put up.

I feel we have an obligation to question a war in which we are engaged as the result of a foreign policy participated in by both parties. As we do that, we do not have to be hawks or doves. We are in a quagmire, and we need to get out of it. It is not for me to say or for you to say, but it is for all of us to insist that we take appropriate action, as long as we are in it, to back the men who are there, to determine what we must have for them and take action to see that an untenable situation does not simply go on and on, with resulting loss of life.

If our friends in other parts of the world will not stand by us, it is better to find out such fact. To support my views, I believe questions and answers of the Secretary, pages 51 through 91 of the hearings would be of interest to you. I read them here:

ADEQUACY OF MILITARY FUNDING

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Secretary, we all are interested in the overall aspects of this matter, but there are two or three things I think might well appear in the record.

I know last year when you were before us and afterward there was quite a difference of opinion and a difference in statements as to whether the reduction in the military funds for the Defense Department would result in perhaps some injury to our defense capabilities.

The committee, in view of that, provided or stated in its report and I read from last year's report on page 9:

"Appropriations to finance any such items of urgent need continue available from prior years in staggering totals. For example, the budget in January 1965 indicated \$30,529,379,000 total unexpended carryover into fiscal 1966, of which a total of \$9,624,627,000 would be unobligated."

I am certain this committee will back your request here. I am not saying it critically in the least.

I think it is well you are here. The point I make here is that the military effort has not suffered from the lack of available funds if you had seen fit to request the use of these funds to meet your need problem up to this point.

Secretary McNAMARA. I fully support that conclusion, Mr. Whitten.

Mr. WHITTEN. You were before us last year in connection with the regular defense bill and again on several supplementals, and Defense Department witnesses have been before us numerous times when we have approved a reprogramming request. If you had foreseen the need of the money you are asking for now, you would have asked for it, would you not?

Secretary McNAMARA. Yes. I stated to the committee in August that we foresaw the need for additional funds but for a number of reasons were not requesting them: (1) we could not predict our needs with certainty, (2) we knew that it would be possible to return in January with a better estimate of those needs, and (3) we felt that the funds which would be available to us in the original fiscal year 1966 budget and the August amendment would carry us through the early part of this calendar year.

Mr. WHITTEN. The point I make is that the defense effort has not suffered from lack of funds either on your part or on the part of Congress.

Secretary McNAMARA. I fully support that conclusion.

EFFECTS OF BOMBING ON NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. WHITTEN. Now carrying it one step further, General Wheeler, I am trying to make clear in my mind, as I understood you in enumerating the targets in North Vietnam, that in effect you indicated that insofar as the present military effort is concerned, where we are having this guerrilla-type warfare, they were what might be termed secondary targets, in that none of them are sufficiently vital as to cripple the Vietcong in their efforts against South Vietnam, is that correct?

General WHEELER. That is essentially correct, Mr. Whitten. I pointed out the other day when I ran over the entire target system—I believe in response to a question from Mr. SIKES—that when we talk of industrial targets in North Vietnam, we are really talking about something that essentially does not exist.

Even so at the levels of conflict in South Vietnam, and with the number of Vietcong and PAVN troops that must be supported, we cannot completely cut off the introduction of supplies. We can hurt them. We can make it cost them more. We cannot cut off the flow of supplies completely.

Mr. WHITTEN. As I understood it either you or the Secretary said, that while there are some changes as a result of the lull in bombing, really it was not as significant as we might think. That, notwithstanding our bombing, due to the fact it is guerrilla warfare they could supply the troops they had even by human beings on trails. As long as that was true the bombing was not—in line with what you just said—sufficient to strangle their supply system. In other words, their capability of supplying so far exceeds the actual need for the present operation that they would probably have that much if we had kept up bombing. Am I recalling it approximately correct?

General WHEELER. I think Mr. McNamara said the greater part of the statement you made, Mr. Whitten.

Mr. WHITTEN. I am asking this to clarify it if my recollection is not correct.

General WHEELER. (Off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Is the chief value of bombing to prevent an enlargement of the Vietcong operation as of now?

General WHEELER. (Off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. I am not trying to play on words but if I could reduce it to this—it is very important to keep them from supplying a much larger force.

General WHEELER. That is my judgment, Mr. Whitten.

March 15, 1966

ABILITY TO PROTECT LOCAL POPULATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. On Wednesday, I believe it was stated that we had received some benefit from the bombing in that the North Vietnamese had become convinced that they were not safe.

In other words, that the North Vietnamese Government could not protect them from air attacks. At that time, I could not help but have the thought that the South Vietnamese, by this time, should be equally convinced that we cannot protect them.

Yesterday's Washington Post—and I am quoting the testimony as I remember it over a series of years—carried a story by Jack Foise of the Los Angeles Times—and I would have to say that this story reflects the impression I have gotten from witnesses on your side of the table, and I read it here:

"SAIGON, January 26.—A U.S. spokesman today described the terrorism and sabotage that goes on in South Vietnam every night. He emphasized the havoc the VC inflict on innocent villagers in the belief that they are pro-Government. But in most areas the villagers would stay neutral if they could. The spokesman also wanted to show what damage has been done by the Vietcong to communications that keep the Government-held areas in touch with one another.

"The spokesman in doing this also revealed the Vietnamese-American inability, despite the substantial U.S. buildup that began 10 months ago, to improve the situation in the countryside for the uncommitted peasant. Reading from a summary of reports by American field representatives, the spokesman estimated that no more than 10 percent of the entire Vietnam railroad system is operative because of guerrilla cuts in the line. If true, this is worse than the previous low point of last July, when it was officially reported only 30 percent was so protected."

Is that approximately correct?

General WHEELER. Mr. WHITTEN, that article is a series of generalized statements drawn from (off the record).

Mr. WHITTEN. General, that is all right. I do not mean to appear to be abrupt. We have been briefed at the White House. We have been on this committee listening and we have had details. I have yet to hear witnesses say that there is any place where people are perfectly safe. It may be that you are willing to so state. I am asking these questions after listening to a lot of people and I have yet to hear anyone say that there is any place there where we are safe from the guerrilla warfare or from bombs or anything else. Are you willing to say it?

General WHEELER. I am not saying that, sir.

But what I am saying is that this article is an overstatement, a generalization of things that can happen anywhere, the same thing that can happen in Washington, D.C. When you go out here at night to get into your car, you can get mugged. But generally speaking, Washington, I believe, is a reasonably safe area.

Mr. WHITTEN. Lots of folks in my area kind of draw an analogy between Washington and Vietnam though I am somewhat surprised at your drawing the same one.

USE OF HUMAN TRANSPORT

There is no need of pursuing that further. I was trying to get this quite clear. It is my understanding that this supply line which we were talking about to the north is something like a thousand miles long.

Of course, one man could not carry 50 pounds a thousand miles. How many points of exchange would there be if the supply lines are so much as a thousand miles long, or do we know?

General WHEELER. We have a feel of it, let me say that.

(Discussion off the record.)

GOVERNMENT DESIRED BY PEOPLE OF VIETNAM

Mr. WHITTEN. Carrying that one step further, now, I keep hearing that our purpose in Vietnam is to allow—and I believe I quote correctly—allow people to seek their own destiny. The testimony uncontested insofar as I recall is that Vietnam has a series of villages—. We have been told that the people in a village do not know of anything, usually, except their village and the one next to them and do not care. They never have subjected themselves to a central government, do not know what it is, and do not want one.

Now, when we insist that they subject themselves to a central government, how can you say that is permitting people to seek their own destiny?

Secretary McNAMARA. Mr. Whitten, a very substantial percentage of the people do not live in villages. I would guess that at least 15 percent live in large metropolitan areas, perhaps more than that.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will limit my question to the other 85 percent.

Secretary McNAMARA. I would say at least 15 percent. It may well be more.

Second, I do not think it accurately reflects the situation in Vietnam to say that the people, generally, do not know of anything other than the affairs of their own village plus the affairs of the adjacent village.

Mr. WHITTEN. I may have oversimplified my words.

Secretary McNAMARA. I am sure that is not the situation there.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not want to change the meaning of witnesses who are supposed to be equally well informed.

Secretary McNAMARA. I do not know which witnesses you are speaking of, but I would be happy to review their testimony. Based on my own knowledge of the situation that is not an accurate assessment of the breadth of concern and awareness of the people in the countryside. I have visited literally hundreds of villages there, and I can testify from personal experience that some of the people in the villages, at least those that I have talked to, are informed of and aware of affairs far beyond the limits of their villages. In particular, they are aware of the kind of an environment in which they would live were North Vietnam to come to dominate their area, and they do not wish to live in that kind of environment. We have other evidence to support that conclusion, not the least of which is the movement of people out of these villages when the Vietcong come into the area.

There are hundreds of thousands of refugees who have left Vietcong-controlled areas because they do not wish to live under that kind of control.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think it well to say right here that the specific witness I was quoting was—

I want to say again I am speaking from recollection. I would not want to tie preceding witnesses to the impression or the understanding I have, but that is where my understanding came from. I also would like to say to you, as Secretary of Defense, I doubt that you saw too many villages in person.

Secretary McNAMARA. On the contrary, I have seen a large number of villagers. I visited Vietnam six times in the last 5 years, and I have visited the countryside widely. I do not pretend to be an expert on Vietnamese affairs, but I do say that based on my personal knowledge it would not be correct to state that the typical villager's knowledge of his national government or its programs is negligible or that his knowledge is limited to the affairs of his own and nearby villages.

ADEQUACY OF BOMB INVENTORIES

Mr. WHITTEN. I probably should have prefaced what I said by saying that I just want to understand this.

I am trying to find out where we are and where we are going, and I think the American people are, too. I have the utmost sympathy for you folks because it is your prime job. Is there any credence to the claim that we stopped this bombing because we were short of bombs?

Secretary McNAMARA. Absolutely none. I will give you the bomb inventories. (The information requested is classified and was furnished to the committee.)

SUPPLY SHORTAGES

Mr. WHITTEN. Or other supplies?

Secretary McNAMARA. Absolutely none.

General WHEELER. May I add something to that?

Mr. WHITTEN. I asked the question so you can get the answer in the record.

Secretary McNAMARA. I appreciate that.

General WHEELER. I would like to make a comment, if I might, because I think it is pertinent.

I spent 5 days during the Christmas season visiting Vietnam. I visited Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine units both in Vietnam and in Thailand, and I also visited one of the carriers, staying overnight.

I asked every responsible commander that I saw—and I saw a great many of them down to battalion level—if their operations had been hampered by shortages or deficiencies in consumables. I am talking about ammunition, POL, et cetera. The answer invariably was no, that they had been able to carry out their combat operations.

Secretary McNAMARA. May I make a further comment, Mr. WHITTEN, in order to throw light on this subject? I issued an order to the commanders—. So every bomb that we would have consumed had we continued to bomb North Vietnam has been consumed. It is our estimate or it was our plan, I should say, that during the month of January we would drop 150,000 bombs

That plan was not limited in the slightest degree by bomb shortages.

Mr. SIKES. May I ask one very brief question? I asked the same question of many field commanders and in each instance I was told that there was no essential operation that had been prevented or hindered by lack of supplies.

It was stated, however, that the level of supplies in some areas or in some fields was dropping significantly because of the heavy consumption of supplies and the difficulty of resupplying.

Has that situation been reversed?

General WHEELER. I would not say it is reversed yet, Mr. SIKES. I know that with the improvements that we have obtained over the last couple of months in unloading and in port clearance and so on, the situation is being corrected and we should get up to a very satisfactory operational level of backup in the very near future. In fact, I am thinking in terms now of March for some items and probably June for others.

MILITARY BASE CLOSINGS

Mr. WHITTEN. We have been going to great limits to let the world know that if the Vietcong do not make peace we are prepared to go all out for whatever is required to get them to the peace table. I listened to Secretary Rusk Sunday afternoon. I have listened here. Since it is very apparent that we are putting on a show of force and a threat of force and a willingness to use it, is there any concern that when you announced a cutback of military bases, that it had any bad effect upon our image in the world?

At that time there were many people, including me, who, whatever the merits and however it might have been done, wondered if to announce this curtailment to the world would indicate that we were weakening.

Did you see any sign of that result?

Secretary McNAMARA. Mr. WHITTEN, I have seen no evidence of such a feeling on the part of any foreign power or in the foreign press.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not want to cut you off but let me ask you one thing that you might reply to. Is that possibly one of the reasons that they have refused to take advantage of our lull in bombing and come to the peace table. Could that be one of the reasons?

Secretary McNAMARA. No sir, it could not be one of the reasons.

Mr. WHITTEN. Why do you say it so flatly?

Secretary McNAMARA. Because we do have indications of the kinds of information getting through to them and the kind of information that influences their actions. I have seen no evidence that the elimination of surplus and obsolete military bases—at a time when we are rapidly expanding our budget by announcing a supplemental of \$12.3 billion to the existing budget—has, in any way influenced them.

Mr. WHITTEN. Couldn't they take it that we are now waking up and rectifying a mistake?

Secretary McNAMARA. Are you speaking about the base reduction program as rectifying a mistake?

Mr. WHITTEN. And planes, et cetera.

Secretary McNAMARA. I do not see how it would be possible for them to interpret closing obsolete bases as rectifying a mistake. In any event, I can tell you, Mr. WHITTEN, that no expert that I have talked to has ever even raised this point much less put any weight on it. As a matter of fact, I had one brought over here from London just last week to discuss with me the reaction of the North Vietnamese.

PREVIOUS JUDGEMENTS ON VIETNAM

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me ask two or three questions and then I shall pass the witness on, Mr. Chairman. Last spring we saw no need for this supplemental. I have in front of me your prior statements, Mr. Secretary. I would not want to read them to you. I would not want mine read to me. I know they were sincere and honest and based on the best information you had. This has not worked out like you folks hoped it would and we had hoped it would. Where have we miscalculated, in your opinion?

Secretary McNAMARA. There is an indirect reference, and I know you were very gentle even in the indirect reference. With respect to my prior statements—

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me say this, that this committee has backed your judgment so we are in it, too. I am just asking now with hindsight, where can you point your finger and figure that we miscalculated as a group, not just you?

Secretary McNAMARA. Mr. Chairman, because of the reference to prior statements and in anticipation of such a reference, I went through my prior statements a few weeks ago, and I have extracted all the pertinent parts relating—

Mr. WHITTEN. That is all right. Where would you say we miscalculated? That is my question. Don't get away from my question.

Secretary McNAMARA. I will come to the question. But the question carries an implied reference to prior statements, Mr. Chairman. Therefore, I would ask the permission of the committee to introduce into the record my previous statements on the war in Vietnam. There are 59 of them.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have no objection to that. Mr. MAHON. Yes. They will be included at this point.

(NOTE.—This information appears in vol. I, pp. 57 to 87 of the hearings.)

Mr. WHITTEN. I am making no condemnation for prior opinion.

Secretary McNAMARA. I understand. I appreciate that your reference was gentle. Mr. Chairman, the question was, Where was it that we miscalculated?

Mr. WHITTEN. In your opinion.

Secretary McNAMARA. I do not know if you should call it a miscalculation. I think it is perfectly clear that the North Vietnamese have continued to increase their support of the Vietcong despite the increase in our effort and that of the South Vietnamese. I say that I do not know whether or not this was a miscalculation. If you go through these statements that I have just inserted in the record, or the statements of President Kennedy or those of President Johnson, you will find that they repeatedly refer to this point, namely, that the response required from us will depend to a considerable degree upon the action taken by the aggressor, in this case, the North Vietnamese. We simply cannot predict their actions accurately. We cannot, therefore, predict the amount of force that we will have to bring to bear in order to achieve our political objective. What has happened is that the North Vietnamese have continually increased the amount of resources, men, and material that they have been willing to devote to their objective of subverting and destroying the political institutions of South Vietnam. Whether or not you describe the evolution of the situation in Vietnam as a miscalculation, I think is a question of semantics.

Mr. WHITTEN. It has not turned out like we thought it would. That is a homely way of putting it, but it has not turned out like we thought it would. Where were we wrong in our thinking? That is bringing it down to a level where we all can understand it.

Secretary McNAMARA. I think it was hoped that the South Vietnamese by their own efforts could contain the insurgency that the North Vietnamese has initiated inside South Vietnam. Later, when it became very clear they couldn't, it became necessary for us to supply advisers and substantial amounts of equipment to improve their capability for containing the insurgency. Even with this assistance they couldn't contain the Vietcong, because the North Vietnamese were continuing to expand their program of sending men and material into the south.

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me ask one other question.

(Off the record.)

Secretary McNAMARA. Let me go back because I did not finish—

Mr. WHITTEN. What is the plan for winning?

Secretary McNAMARA. Let me go back to the previous question because I did not finish my statement with respect to the changes that have occurred during the past several years which in turn, affected the amount of effort that we have had to put into the struggle.

Mr. WHITTEN. Don't let us forget my question.

Secretary McNAMARA. I won't. I want to answer one question at a time, however.

I think that one event that significantly influenced the course of the conflict was the overthrow of Diem which was the result of many forces, most of them not within our control. But the Diem overthrow, as much as anything else, affected the course of the conflict in the following year or two.

This factor, plus the continuing increase in the amount of effort that North Vietnam applied to their objective caused a continuing increase in the amount of force which we have had to apply in South Vietnam.

Now your second question, How do we hope to win?

Mr. WHITTEN. How do we plan to win?

Secretary McNAMARA. I am answering the question as it was phrased.

PLAN FOR WINNING THE WAR

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me change my question, What is our plan to win?

Secretary McNAMARA. All right, what is our plan to win? We plan with the help of the South Vietnamese to apply sufficient force against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese military units in the south to

prove to them that they cannot win in the south. While doing so, we have applied bombing to the north to increase the cost of their operations in the south and to reduce their capability for expanding their operations in the south.

Mr. WHITTEN. Have we not already tried that and failed, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary McNAMARA. No. We have not failed, we have not lost.

ECONOMIC COST OF THE WAR

Mr. WHITTEN. We have not lost, but we certainly have not won. I think you are doing as well as you can with what you have to do in the situation we are in, so I am not being critical—I have yet to find anybody who has a plan to win. We cannot do it by bombing these targets in North Vietnam. I do not know what the relative cost of the war per day in money is to us as compared to them. I do know their standard of living. They carry supplies on their backs. Human beings are almost unlimited in that area of the world. I know it is way around the world from us. Let me interrupt to ask, Have you any comparative dollar cost?

Secretary McNAMARA. No.

Mr. WHITTEN. You do not figure war in money, but I am talking about the drain on your economy. Could you give us any kind of comparison as to the relative per day cost to the United States as compared with them?

Secretary McNAMARA. There is no possible means of developing that financially.

Mr. WHITTEN. It would be tremendously greater, would it not?

Secretary McNAMARA. The cost in economic terms is far greater to them than it is to us. One simple indication is that the intelligence estimators conclude that they have diverted from ——— thousand men from other pursuits to rebuild the roads and the bridges which our bombing has destroyed. And that particular diversion of the work force is but a minor part of their cost of carrying on their operations against the south. Out of a society that has a total adult male population of perhaps 4 or 5 million, that is a tremendous drain for just one part of their war activity. So there is no question but what the relative economic cost to them is far greater than it is to us.

PLAN FOR WINNING THE WAR

General WHEELER. May I answer your question about what is our plan? You said you do not know of a plan.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would be glad to have you do so.

General WHEELER. Before I do, though, I would like to put in one remark that is perhaps not completely germane to this. (Off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. The closing of bases and cutting back of the military.

General WHEELER. No, sir.

That is my point. Now let me go to the other one if I might. We have actually had in South Vietnam substantial numbers of U.S. and free world combat forces for about 6 months. You should recognize that even then the weight of effort has been available only within about the last 2 months.

The Republic of Korea division, for example, was only available to General Westmoreland in a combat configuration late in the month of November. General Westmoreland has achieved to date, precisely what we estimated he would have achieved with these accruals of force; namely, he has reversed an adverse trend of military events. While he has not yet achieved a momentum which will give him "victory," he actually has just begun his campaign. His concept, which is, I believe, a sound concept and one to which I subscribe, is this—

Mr. MAHON. You mean the South Vietnamese?

General WHEELER. Yes, sir. (Off the record.) It is not going to be a quick process, but it has been successful to date.

March 15, 1966

Mr. WHITTEN. You use the word "win" the war, and it is natural. What do you mean by "win" the war?

General WHEELER. I mean, sir, the political objective set for us by the President; namely, a free and independent Vietnam which can pursue its own destiny unhampered and unpressured by outside forces, has been met.

EVENTS WHICH WOULD FOLLOW PEACE AGREEMENT

Mr. WHITTEN. This is the last question, Mr. Chairman. As you can imagine I could go on all day and we all could. What if tomorrow Hanoi and the North Vietnamese Government would say that we will agree that the South Vietnamese may go their own way and follow their destiny, whether it is in a local village or in a central government; we will agree that each village that does not want to be subjected to any central government be like it wants to be? If they send us that message through channels and it reached you and it reached the White House, what would we do?

Secretary McNAMARA. I am not clear what you said about each village.

Mr. WHITTEN. I said if they agree.

Secretary McNAMARA. Pardon me?

Mr. WHITTEN. You said you did not understand. I want to make it clear, Mr. Secretary. If they agreed that they would do what we claim we want them to do.

Secretary McNAMARA. That is not the way it was phrased.

Mr. WHITTEN. I will change it because I am not playing on words. This situation is serious and I think the American people are like me, I do not think they believe that we have a plan to win.

Secretary McNAMARA. Let me say this: If tomorrow, North Vietnam says they will agree to do what we want—

Mr. WHITTEN. What will we do?

Secretary McNAMARA. Then, we would plan to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam as soon as the North Vietnamese demonstrated that they were sincere and had a real plan of action for the withdrawal of their subversive forces and would allow the South Vietnamese Government to develop, unhampered, stable political institutions in areas now controlled by the Vietcong. As soon as it was evident that the North Vietnamese were carrying out such a pledge, we would withdraw our forces and allow the Government of South Vietnam to work with its people as any other government does.

Mr. WHITTEN. Pending that time we would insist keeping our people there to enforce it.

Secretary McNAMARA. To enforce what?

Mr. WHITTEN. To enforce the carrying out of the agreement.

Secretary McNAMARA. We would stay only to protect the Government and the people of South Vietnam against a violation of the agreement.

Mr. WHITTEN. At this stage, and this is my last question: Haven't they convinced you that there will never be any agreement as long as a part of it is that you insist that you keep your people there to enforce such agreement?

Secretary McNAMARA. No; I do not think that this is a major element of the problem.

Mr. WHITTEN. What is your feeling based on?

Secretary McNAMARA. In the first place we do not insist that we keep our forces there, as you put it. The enforcement of an agreement is not part of our proposal, nor have we ever made any public statement to that effect.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thought you told me that is what you would do.

Secretary McNAMARA. No, I simply said—

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. McNamara, what would we do then?

Secretary McNAMARA. I said that if tomorrow the North Vietnamese pledge that they will do what we want them to do, we will withdraw our forces as we see evidence in

their actions that they are carrying out that pledge. The actions that we would like to see are: the withdrawal of their military units from South Vietnam and the cessation of their direction and support of the Vietcong and the guerrillas who are attempting to subvert the political institutions in the south.

INDICATIONS OF NORTH VIETNAMESE STOPPING AGGRESSION

Mr. WHITTEN. At this stage, having had your experience and having at least been thwarted in our high hopes—if you do not like the word "miscalculate"—what evidence is there in the actions of the Vietcong, Hanoi, or the North Vietnamese Government, that leads you to have any hopes that they will change their attitude?

Secretary McNAMARA. We see signs of dissension among the political leaders of the north. We see signs of strain on their economy. We know that they see the buildup as General Wheeler mentioned a moment ago, of our capability to inflict even higher levels of casualties on the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. I think it is a reasonable conclusion that at some point these rising casualties, and these higher costs, and these increasing strains are going to become so great that they will conclude that they cannot win in the south. When they reach this conclusion, they will be unwilling to continue to bear the costs of a program that cannot achieve their objectives.

Mr. WHITTEN. I keep wanting to end my questions because I am taking too much time. You say they cannot win and you say we can win because we have not lost.

THE BUDGET—NOT THE MAJOR CONCERN

So far as arguments about budgets are concerned, I served in my State legislature when I was 21. I learned then that a budget represents the highest hopes of the administration for income from taxes and the greatest expectation for holding down expenditures; and the other side never accepts such estimates and is usually right. I have not seen any difference here in Congress, either under the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. It works the same as State administrations.

This argument has very little to do with this bill before us now, where we are in trouble up to the ears and where we are going to have to take firm steps to back the men in the service. This money will be gone when we appropriate it, but it will be used for an absolutely essential and necessary purpose.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the supplemental appropriation of \$13.1 billion to back up our commitment of men and material in South Vietnam.

There is no debating the immediate necessity in approving these funds. Indeed, I predicted as early as last summer that these funds would be required. I strongly urge unanimous and anticipate quick approval by the House. Nearly 300,000 of our American troops in the Far East are looking to us for prompt support of their efforts to defeat Communist aggression.

But, as a member of the Department of Defense Appropriations Subcommittee which took initial action on this supplemental request, I would be remiss if I did not call the attention of my colleagues to the additional views accom-

panying the report on the bill before us. The debate thus far has not given these views the attention they deserve.

In these additional views Congressmen LIPSCOMB and LAIRD and I point out the diminishing effectiveness of the appropriations system under the heavy-handed practices of the Department of Defense.

Within the last few years we have grown increasingly concerned as the Defense Subcommittee and the Congress are relegated more and more to the role of rubberstamp in approving the dictates of the Department of Defense.

The appearances of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their backup witnesses, grow more perfunctory each year. The abuse of the "top secret" stamp to blank out politically sensitive portions of their testimony before the subcommittee is evermore in evidence. It has reached the point where witnesses have in effect withheld their own views from the committee unless pressed, and, when pressed, argue against their own position if it is contrary to top level Department of Defense policy.

We three minority members of the subcommittee feel that a blackout on much essential information was reached some time ago as far as the American public is concerned. It is approaching a critical point as far as the Defense Subcommittee is involved.

I call to the attention of the House that there were only 2 days of hearings on the bill we will pass today.

It is our strong conviction that insufficient attention was paid to maintaining sufficient forces to meet U.S. commitments in portions of the world other than Vietnam. We are convinced that defense needs have been underestimated in the 1967 budget now under consideration, just as they were underestimated last year, and that there will be supplemental requests later this year similar to the one before us this afternoon.

For those of you who have not had an opportunity to carefully read the additional views in the report, let me quote from the summary:

The growing frequency of reprogramming actions is of particular concern because it represents, in effect, a bypassing of Congress on matters that are often of critical concern.

The financing of the war by supplemental demonstrates a growing lack of planning which could, if not altered, produce serious risks for the future security of the United States, and, indeed of the free world.

The growing tendency on the part of committees of Congress to consider grave matters in perpetual haste can only insure a continued and rapidly increasing loss of control by the Congress over executive decisions and actions.

This committee has a vital role to play in insuring an adequate defense posture for the United States. That role cannot be discharged without full cooperation from the executive branch.

Nor will it be discharged properly and effectively until the Congress and its committees reassert their traditional powers.

I strongly subscribe to these sentiments.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN] such time as he may consume.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the supplemental defense appropriation for 1966.

Last November I had an opportunity to visit Marine units in Vietnam. Much of my time was spent with the 3d Marine Division, the same division I served with in the Second World War.

Unfounded reports have been circulated concerning the adequacy of supplies for our troops. I found that our servicemen were well equipped with every necessary item for the conduct of their operations. In fact, they are better equipped than we were in World War II.

The fact remains that the Marines are responsible for the pacification and security of vast land areas in the vicinity of Da Nang, Chu Lai, and Hue Phu Bai. Their objectives cannot be achieved without more men and support.

The funds we are asked to approve today will serve a vital function in supplying more men, supplies and construction in Vietnam. In addition, this appropriation will speed the activation of the 5th Marine Division at Camp Pendleton, Calif. This division, in turn, constitutes an essential support for our Vietnamese efforts.

American and allied personnel in Vietnam deserve our strongest backing. The supplemental defense appropriation is required if the United States is to maintain our firm policy in resisting Communist aggression. That firm policy is our best hope of achieving a negotiated settlement.

The specific appropriations for the Marine Corps are: \$184,600,000 for personnel, \$102,600,000 for operation and maintenance and \$516,600,000 for procurement. In each instance I am glad to say that our Appropriations Committee has recommended the full amount requested by the Department of Defense.

(Mr. CORMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, many people ask why we are in South Vietnam. We are there because we agreed to help the people of South Vietnam establish their new nation. This they were doing with remarkable progress until North Vietnam, in violation of the Geneva accords, organized, armed, and directed the National Liberation Front—Vietcong—in a campaign of terror and aggression to impose communism on the people of South Vietnam. We are helping South Vietnam to resist that aggression. It is fruitless to debate now whether or not we should have undertaken this course. We did so. If we fail to honor our present commitments, we will encourage similar Communist aggression elsewhere.

Vietnam is the latest of many efforts by the Communist nations to expand their territory, and it must be viewed in its proper historical perspective.

In 1947 President Truman enunciated the Truman doctrine as follows:

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure.

In pursuance of that policy, massive U.S. aid to Greece and Turkey saved both nations from Communist conquest. We followed the same policy successfully in Lebanon. Soviet Russia eventually satisfied itself that we would not permit further expansion in Europe and the Near East and turned its attentions elsewhere.

The war in Korea was part of the same pattern. Our resistance halted Communist expansion in that part of Asia. The Chinese have shown an appreciation of our firm intentions and our power with respect to Formosa, and have refrained from attacking in that area even though it must be the prize they desire above all others. Now we are resisting the effort to expand into southeast Asia. Many people fear that we risk war with China or that we are on a course that will lead inevitably to such a war. In my opinion, the lessons of history show that war with China would be far more likely if we permit them to succeed in their aggression in Vietnam. If we stand firm in Vietnam, history leads me to believe that the Chinese in Asia, like the Russians in Europe, may turn from unrewarding aggression to more peaceful endeavors.

Recent discussion has centered about two questions. The first is: Who should participate in a peace conference? The second is: What should be the government of South Vietnam during and after a conference? Related to these questions are various suggestions to submit the whole problem to the U.N. or to propose arbitration by the countries who participated in the Geneva conferences.

In my opinion, these are artificial and academic questions.

The United States has made clear, time after time, that we wish to go to a peace conference. We are ready to negotiate. We have asked the U.N. to help. We have said that there will be no difficulty in having the views of the Vietcong represented at a peace conference. This is not an insurmountable problem.

The insurmountable problem is the fact that North Vietnam will not agree to a peace conference. It will not agree to arbitration. It will not agree to a U.N. settlement of the dispute. North Vietnam has said repeatedly that it will settle the whole business only if we would recognize the Vietcong as the sole representative of South Vietnam and if we will withdraw our troops. These are conditions that North Vietnam insist upon before any conference, arbitration or other discussion can begin. In other words, North Vietnam demands the unconditional surrender of South Vietnam and its allies including the United States. It is fruitless for us to have a domestic argument over this issue. Our Government has explored and continued to explore every possible avenue for settling the conflict. North Vietnam is not willing.

The second question, What shall be the government of South Vietnam during and after a conference? is the central issue of the conflict. South Vietnam is a nation recognized by 70 other nations of the world. We cannot and do not wish to impose a government on this nation and we are fighting to prevent the Communists from doing so. We have said that we will abide by the results of a free election.

Then there is the question of the conduct of the war. Many letters suggest a blockade, quarantine, the bombing of various targets. I am not a military strategist, but I do believe that the air and sea power of the United States could be employed more effectively than has been the case to date and that we can and should bring this conflict to a speedy conclusion. Moreover, I believe that great improvements can be made in the support of our troops. We can and must make certain that they have everything that is required for the success of their mission and for their personal safety and comfort insofar as either can be provided under the conditions of war.

We have suffered many casualties in South Vietnam. This heart-rending loss can be justified only if we achieve the objectives we have set. If aggression is rewarded in Vietnam the same tactic will be tried elsewhere and the cost of overcoming it may be far greater than the price we are paying today. Nations that seek peace at any price usually find the price is a downpayment on a bigger war.

I believe it is necessary that we pass this supplemental today. I would hope that it would pass unanimously so that we can demonstrate to the world the solidarity of the representatives of the people in the conflict in which we are now engaged.

There will be other supplementals in the near future, not involving Vietnam, which I will not support as I am supporting this one. And it seems to me that this is a proper time to add a word of caution as to the terrific burden we are putting on the shoulders of the taxpayers of this Nation of ours. The interest on our national debt is costing us almost \$25,000 every minute.

We cannot continue to build this great public debt and avoid inflation, which is not just threatening us, but which is actually here. It would seem to me that two courses lie ahead. Either we cut down this excessive spending in many of the Great Society areas or we substantially increase taxes. I shall not at this time spell out specific items which, if not entirely eliminated from future consideration, should be delayed at this period when we are engaged in a conflict such as the one in South Vietnam. It is not difficult for my colleagues to know the areas where these cuts can be made.

It would also seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come when a careful review should be made as to the extent of our commitments in Europe and careful consideration should be given to the withdrawal from Europe of many of our troops. If President de Gaulle seems so confident that NATO is no longer necessary, then it would seem to me that it is time that we bring many of our forces and their dependents now living abroad home. This not only would reduce these great expenditures, but would also help solve our balance-of-payments problem.

We cannot and should not continue down the road we have been traveling these many months and years, but we must again embark upon a program of fiscal responsibility if we are not to de-

March 15, 1966

stroy at home that which we are fighting to preserve in southeast Asia.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], our distinguished minority leader.

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I would like to compliment the Committee on Appropriations and its various subcommittees that have had jurisdiction over the consideration of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the full committee and the subcommittee have done a first-class job in responding to the request of the executive branch of the Government. Also I wish to compliment those three Members of the minority who did write excellent minority views setting forth the minority's viewpoint on certain aspects of defense policy and the carrying out of the programs thereunder.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the record is clear that the Department of Defense in the past year has been uncertain as to what its needs were. This uncertainty has resulted in their underestimating the expenditures which have developed in the prosecution of the conflict in Vietnam.

This underestimating of expenditures, Mr. Chairman, has to a substantial degree created some of our economic problems which we are facing domestically today. The uncertainty as to the course of the war and our policy and the underestimation of expenditures by the Defense Department has created to a very significant degree the inflationary pressures which we face in the United States at the present time.

I believe that the Department of Defense could have done a better job in the last 12 months in forecasting what their expenditures would be. It is my hope that their forecast of expenditures for the next 12 months are more accurate. If these estimates are not more accurate, we will be faced with an even more serious inflationary problem than we have on our doorstep at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, this country has had during my time here in the Congress outstanding men on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has been my privilege over the years to know many of them intimately. I was annually privileged from 1953 through 1964 to hear the testimony of the able members of the Joint Chiefs for a period of 12 years. I think this country is blessed that men of their caliber and their experience are giving us the kind of military advice and leadership that is so essential in the crisis we face at the present time. It is my most sincere hope that the Commander in Chief, who was elected by the American people, will follow the wise and sound recommendations of these men who over the years have dedicated their lives to giving this country the kind of military strength and leadership that we need in this crucial hour.

At times in past months I have felt that our military leaders' advice has not been followed to the degree that it should

have been. But be that as it may, with the problems getting more and more critical in Vietnam and elsewhere, it is my strong belief that the Commander in Chief should to the maximum degree follow the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs under the leadership of our able Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Wheeler.

Mr. Chairman, it seems at the present that our Nation is following a course of action of strength against Communist aggression in southeast Asia. It appears to me our Nation is meeting the challenge of communism in South Vietnam. This legislation we have before us today will give substance to the ability of our troops and our military leaders to meet this challenge.

Mr. Chairman, the approval of this legislation today will back up the policy, the posture, and the position that I think our Government is taking in Vietnam today. It may not be enough and there may be more required in the months ahead. But this is a tangible way for every one of us to indicate our support for what appears to be our Nation's policy at the moment.

It is crystal clear to me that anyone who votes for this legislation is endorsing the policy currently being executed by the Commander in Chief.

Let me add this postscript. When the roll is called today—and I trust there will be a unanimous vote for this legislation—I do hope there will not be qualifying statements made outside of the Chamber. I hope there will not be petitions signed which would, in effect, withdraw the kind of support that an "aye" vote gives to the position, the posture, and the policy that I think our Nation has and ought to have in this crisis.

I think the President, if he is to follow this course of action, must have our support in its execution, in its implementation, and in the funding requirements to carry out that policy.

People cannot vote "aye" today and then issue a statement tomorrow withdrawing support. An "aye" vote means just one thing—that the elected Commander in Chief of our country, whether we voted for him or not, will have \$13 billion to use for the purpose of supporting a position of firmness against Communist aggression.

If more is needed, this House and the other Chamber will make it available.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the vote today will be unanimous.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, of course, with most of what the distinguished minority leader has said I am certainly in agreement, particularly with respect to the last part of his fine speech. I believe the gentleman has said that the Defense Department has been uncertain as to what its requirements are. I would like to comment briefly on that one statement. Of course, there has been an element of uncertainty in what the problem was going to be in Vietnam, and there is still that element of uncertainty. There are so many possibilities

in the picture that it would be almost impossible for anyone to prognosticate what is going to happen 6 months, a year, or 2 years from now in that part of the world.

I think the gentleman would agree with me that it would be the part of wisdom to base estimates of needed expenditures on facts that are known, or reasonably known and reasonably projected, rather than simply upon unreviewed future possible requirements that are not within the reasonable knowledge of those who are making the estimates. I am sure the gentleman does not want the Congress to make available for military spending huge and unreviewed sums of money.

The gentleman will recall that during the Korean war defense appropriations increased \$35 billion in 1 year, durable goods manufacturing industries' volume of unfilled orders increased by \$34 billion in 1 year, and wholesale prices skyrocketed by 11.4 percent between 1950 and 1951.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In response to the observations of my good friend, the able majority leader, I do not believe that we can compare the circumstances of June 1950 with the circumstances of the last 6 or 12 months. In 1950, as I recall, we had had submitted to us a military budget for \$13 billion, and all of a sudden, in late June of 1950, we were faced with a very grave and critical military situation in Korea. Almost overnight the Congress, as I recall, went from the budget that had been submitted by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, of \$13 billion, to a military budget of \$70 to \$80 billion.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I agree with what the gentleman is saying. The circumstances are certainly different. But the effects of overfunding and overappropriating are not different; and that is the point I am trying to make. Requests for appropriations should be based on careful consideration of needs and resources. Appropriations should be requested when needs are known and not when we do not know how much might be needed. It is not the part of wisdom to overappropriate and to permit excessive funding.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me respond and then I will yield to my friend from Wisconsin. It does not seem to me that the Congress, in light of the fact that we have had three supplemental bills, and in light of the probability that we are going to have another supplemental in the next month or so, has overappropriated. It hardly seems fair to say that we have overappropriated.

Mr. ALBERT. I am not saying that we have overappropriated. I am merely advising that it would not be the part of wisdom to do so. I am trying to defend the position which the administration has taken. I think its course under the facts known at the time requests were made has been sound.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. There is quite a difference, as the gentleman knows, between making obligation au-

March 15, 1966

thority available and actual expenditures.

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, that is true.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I do not believe that the Defense Department has asked for an adequate amount of obligation authority.

Mr. ALBERT. I think that is a question of judgment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And for this reason, they have had to come back periodically for their various supplementals.

But, leaving that aside, even with the obligation authority they had available and that which they anticipated the Congress would give them, they have not accurately forecast their expenditures. Military expenditures which have been underestimated have created or caused the serious inflation to a substantial degree in the circumstances of our economy today.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course they have not always accurately forecast what was going to happen. Had they done that, they undoubtedly would have asked for exactly what they needed, which would be ideal. Again, however, I commend the gentleman on the balance of his remarks.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I appreciate the kind comments made by the gentleman from Oklahoma on other portions of my remarks. As he well knows, people probably far wiser than we and more knowledgeable than we on these intricate problems of the economy and inflation have honorably disagreed. So on this issue I do not mind disagreeing with my friend from Oklahoma. I am delighted that on the other areas there is a high degree of unanimity on the position of our country and the policy we ought to follow.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS].

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this subcommittee, I support this bill.

There has been a lot of argument about how we got into Vietnam and whether or not we should be there, and so on. In my opinion such arguments are academic. The fact remains that our people are committed in South Vietnam today, our men are being wounded and killed in South Vietnam, our flag is being fired upon in South Vietnam. It behooves Americans to support those men in South Vietnam all the way, and that is all this bill does. It provides the tools of war for our men in the hope—in the prayerful hope—Mr. Chairman, that this war can soon be terminated.

I hope that there is not a single vote against this bill, on a rollcall, so that we let the world know that this Congress is supporting our fighting men in South Vietnam.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. VIVIAN].

(Mr. VIVIAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, for the past 12 years this Nation has had the opportunity to aid in establishing a pop-

ular and stable government in South Vietnam. For at least 11 of those 12 years they, and we, have failed.

As a result, today our youth are slogging through the mud in South Vietnam, killing—and dying—in order to preserve for this Nation a longer time, the opportunity, the possibility to try once again. For that is all our soldiers can accomplish. That is all this appropriation can accomplish—to gain time and to hold open an opportunity.

We owe these brave and uncomplaining men and the Vietnamese people on whose land they fight—the greatest possible effort on our part to form, to build, to secure a government in South Vietnam which is popular enough to quell the conflict, and to build an economy there which is productive enough to support its peoples.

Hundreds of American civilians have committed their energies, some even their lives, in South Vietnam in the past months, to build the base and structure of social and economic and political life needed in that land in order that a government, in those famous words, "of the people, by the people, and for the people" can be created and then prevail.

Thousands of American troops are needed there now, to provide protection for the harassed and fearful Vietnamese villagers and farmers.

But can only a few hundred civilians complete this enormous task: the reconstruction of a society, in a reasonable time, so that the opportunity for which our 220,000 soldiers fight is not simply wasted? Are we not failing our troops tragically, by hoping that this small band of only a few hundred can untangle the inheritance of centuries of misrule?

Our record for the past 12 years is not impressive. The reasons are many. But one stands out.

In earlier years it was difficult for us to accept the necessity for military intervention in South Vietnam. Today, it remains difficult for us to accept that we must participate and intervene far more aggressively, not only in the economic, but also in the social and political fields.

If we are not prepared to do this, then we should get out of South Vietnam at once. Yet, while many of our citizens strongly support the conscription of our young men to service with gun and flamethrower, sadly enough we find very few of those citizens willing to go to South Vietnam to serve in a civilian capacity: to rebuild and build anew.

The Agency for International Development needs men in Vietnam. The International Voluntary Services, a nongovernmental organization similar to the Peace Corps, needs men for Vietnam.

I ask that all of us here, and the leaders in our administration, urgently emphasize the great and immediate need of this Nation for courageous men and women to serve in these absolutely essential roles. I am certain that our citizens desire to live some day in peace, as brothers, with the peoples in Asia.

I will support this appropriation of money, but I ask others here to support

my request to pay this money to the right men. Our current course of action will not produce the result we seek unless we rebalance our efforts.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain language provisions in the legislation before us, and I would call your attention specifically to section 102. The version of the bill before us contains the language proposed by the President in his budget estimate. However, the conference version of the bill authorizing our military procurement items, and so forth, provided language somewhat different than that which had been proposed.

I shall offer an amendment to make the language in this bill comport not to the budget language, but to the language which has been agreed to and which, I understand, has become the law. I shall offer an amendment which will strengthen the position of the Congress insofar as the control of these funds is concerned. It will be submitted, of course, during the reading of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I now ask that the Clerk read.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the Department of Defense supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1966 in the amount of \$13,135,719,000.

My support is based upon the necessity and the awareness that these funds must be provided to back up our Nation's commitment of men and material in Vietnam. In recent days we have learned that another 20,000 American military men have been committed to Vietnam which will bring our total forces there to approximately 235,000 in the near future.

There is included in this supplemental appropriations bill \$375 million in foreign military assistance funds and \$315 million for economic assistance to South Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, and the Dominican Republic. Another \$100 million is allocated to the contingency fund.

The minority members of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee have expressed a deep concern, which I share, about "the growing disregard evidenced on the part of the executive branch toward the appropriations process."

They cited the fact that a massive \$12.3 billion supplemental request was considered in the short span of 2 days by the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

It should also be pointed out that the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, on which I serve, held but 1 day of hearings on the economic and military assistance requests contained in this bill.

In the area of foreign aid, the administration has promised new directions of this massive assistance program. Such redirection and reevaluation of the program should be undertaken deliberately and not through deficiency fund requests.

In this supplemental request there are certain programs which are worthy of our support. One of these is civil police programs in Thailand and Vietnam.

A substantial amount of the supplemental request for Thailand will go for this police program including such equipment as radios and transmitters. It is my understanding that approximately \$27 million will be allocated for public safety and police in Vietnam.

On the recent trip which I made with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee [Mr. PASSMAN], I had the opportunity of seeing firsthand the police training program in Thailand. I was impressed by the work of Mr. Jeter L. Williamson, the Chief of the Public Safety Division of our U.S. Operations Mission in Thailand and of other American experts assisting the Thais in this important program. This is a practical kind of program conducted by the United States to help the Government of Thailand increase the security of its border area and rapidly develop the counter-insurgency capability of the Thai civil police. This same kind of program is being conducted in Vietnam and I was advised that it will cover 72,000 men there.

There are questions which await answers as we consider this further funding to support the American commitment in Vietnam.

Why does not the administration more aggressively pursue necessary efforts to bring about a halt to free world shipping to North Vietnam?

When I questioned the Administrator of the Agency for International Development last month regarding this problem, he advised me, and I quote from the hearings:

Last November, the only ships that called at North Vietnam outside of the Communist bloc countries were several flying the British flag but actually based in Hong Kong. We are not, of course, providing any U.S. assistance to Britain.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are disturbed, as am I, by the continuing trade by our allies with North Vietnam when American lives are being lost in far-off Vietnam.

The American people are puzzled by administration policy which calls for instant cooperation with Great Britain in its difficulties with Rhodesia; but deals softly with the British regarding their trade with North Vietnam.

Last year I made a motion at the time we had the conference report on foreign aid appropriations before the House to stop aid to the countries shipping materials to North Vietnam. That motion was defeated, and the President retained authority to use his discretion in giving such aid. In recent months, there has been legislation introduced to bar countries serving North Vietnam from sending their ships to U.S. ports. The administration has blacklisted certain ships from carrying Government-financed cargoes; but this action does not go far enough.

Another question which many Americans are asking: What is being done to secure the cooperation and participation of our allies in the Vietnam conflict?

The American people have poured billions of dollars into aiding our European allies, both militarily and economically,

since World War II. Now that the United States has gone to the aid of South Vietnam, it is obvious that the response for meaningful assistance from our allies has not been deafening.

We will, however, examine very carefully and with interest the administration's 1967 foreign aid budgets for respective countries around the world. We will keep in mind the 235,000 Americans who are on the frontlines fighting communism in southeast Asia, and in the political vernacular, we will ask the administration spokesmen:

"What have these countries we are aiding done for us lately?"

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I believe my position is clear on our commitment in southeast Asia. I have been opposed to our military policy in Vietnam. I am strongly opposed to escalation of the war, and I am distressed by the deterioration of our foreign and domestic policies which has been brought on by our Vietnam operations.

I will vote for H.R. 13546, the supplemental southeast Asia appropriation measure before this House today. I will do so because I feel it is unwise to decide policy issues through the appropriations process. It is the job of the authorizing committees to debate policy matters. It is the job of the Appropriations Committees to oversee the administration of duly authorized funds.

A year ago, I opposed the \$700 million supplemental appropriation for Vietnam. I oppose that appropriation because it was used only as a ruse to obtain approval of administration policy in Vietnam. The \$13.1 billion appropriation before us today—19 times as much money as we approved on May 5, 1965—has been duly authorized. My policy reservations have been stated earlier. Today I can but remind my colleagues of them.

My vote for this appropriation means two things. It does not alone mean that I do not believe it is proper to express my policy preferences in an appropriations measure. It also means that an appropriations measure should not be used by anyone else to express their policy preferences. My vote today is not an endorsement of our past policy in Vietnam. It is not an endorsement of our future policy in Vietnam. It is not an endorsement of military escalation. It is not an endorsement of the mining of Haiphong Harbor. And, it is not an endorsement of any increase in troop commitments. It is merely a certification of prior House action on authorization measures.

In supporting this measure and discussing it with my colleagues in the House today, I am compelled to make certain observations about its contents. In voting \$13.1 billion today, we are doing many things, and must be aware of them.

We are appropriating \$275 million for economic assistance programs within Vietnam. However, we are in this same bill appropriating \$742.6 million for military construction within Vietnam alone. Thus we will spend in the coming fiscal year 270 percent more money

for military construction than for socio-economic reconstruction. And, we are spending \$3.2 billion for aircraft procurement and \$2.1 billion for procurement of munitions and associated equipment. All of this money, as the report of our able Committee on Appropriations states, is "the amount of the budget estimates for the military, military assistance, and economic assistance programs of the Government directly related to operations in southeast Asia." Thus, in the coming fiscal year, our country will spend \$1.1 billion to build in Vietnam, and \$5.3 billion for the aircraft and munitions which will destroy the resources of Vietnam. As I told this House only 13 days ago, we will continue to see destruction outpacing development. We will continue to see our military commitment make a mockery of our calls for economic development; for a policy of millions for development and billions for destruction cannot succeed.

My colleagues should also be aware that, despite the opening disclaimer of the Appropriations Committee report, not all the money in H.R. 13546 is going to programs related to southeast Asia. Twenty-five million dollars is going to the Dominican Republic in the form of economic aid.

Finally, we should be aware that the \$375 million appropriated for foreign military assistance will, according to the committee report, "be recorded on the books of the military assistance program and paid to the applicable procurement appropriation accounts of the military services, to reimburse those accounts for the value of goods already delivered to military assistance recipients." A minority of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee noted that this "was given scant attention by this committee." I would only note that in our debates over the misuse of foreign military aid, we should not allow such aid to be awarded through the military appropriation proper. Foreign military aid is a separate issue with distinct problems, and should be considered separately.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this massive, supplemental defense appropriation bill. The Nation is engaged in a critical war and our military efforts must be fully supported.

Nevertheless, I am deeply concerned about the manner in which this legislation is being handled. We are here acting on a bill appropriating \$12,345,719,000 for the military functions of the Department of Defense, \$375 million for the President to allot in military assistance, and \$415 million for him to allocate in economic assistance.

This vast total is being handled in a supplemental appropriation bill on which the Appropriation Committee held only 2 days of hearings. In that time, of course, only the most cursory consideration could be given. In effect, Congress is unable to perform its constitutional task of carefully scrutinizing the administration's requests and weighing them in detail.

In view of this haste, one must question the wisdom and foresight of a government which, just a few months ago, did not conceive of these enormous extra

March 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

5569

expenses, reduced taxes and said we could afford them but now has to raise them and seek from Congress an additional \$13 plus billion.

Either the Government has not been honest in telling us what the war in Vietnam was going to cost or its planning has been extremely bad.

One does not wish to think that the Government does not know what it is doing nor does one wish to think that it is deliberately concealing facts from the public. It is hard, however, to avoid reaching either one conclusion or the other or, indeed, both.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the first supplemental defense appropriation bill in this session for the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. It embodies the \$4.8 billion which the House authorized on March 1.

When the \$4.8 billion authorization bill was before the House, I pointed out that a basic issue of policy was involved. It was, I said, a bill to finance escalation, not to finance an existing policy. I spelled out in my speech on March 1 my reasons for opposing what I called a policy of mindful escalation and my view that a policy of stabilization should be pursued. What I said then applies today.

Mr. Chairman, the heart of this appropriations bill is the \$4.8 billion which was authorized on March 1. In effect, the appropriation contains an escalation rider. It is not simply an appropriation to support the present effort in Vietnam. The funds are intended to escalate the war. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], said earlier this afternoon that "the war will escalate and grow in intensity."

This is not simply an appropriation to provide supplies and equipment to the courageous American fighting men who are engaged in combat. If that were the purpose, there would be no argument. As long as they are committed to battle, our dedicated forces must be adequately equipped, supplied, and protected in carrying out assigned missions. The real issue is the policy question embedded in the authorization and now in the appropriation.

In my speech on the supplemental defense authorization on March 1, I discussed what I understood to be the implications of our vote. I said then that a debate was raging between those who believe that we should stabilize the war and those who believe that we should escalate it mindfully. That debate still continues.

The only opportunity the House has to express its views on foreign policy is when we are asked to authorize or appropriate funds. If we are to participate in this debate on Vietnam policy, we must do so this afternoon. An affirmative vote, no matter how individual Members of the House may regard it, will be interpreted by the administration and the public as a full endorsement of administration policy. A vote for this bill is a vote for the escalation rider as well.

My vote this afternoon is not an easy one to cast. My thoughts are very much with the gallant American fighting men in Vietnam. They should not be denied

anything they need. I too fought in a jungle war in the Pacific some 20 years ago. However, the administration has asked us to appropriate funds to allow the President to escalate the war. Once again the crucial question is not whether we will support the men in the field, but whether we will give the President the funds to commit hundreds of thousands of additional young men to this war on the Asian mainland. As the Vietnam war stands today, this I am unwilling to do.

Mr. Chairman, instead of pursuing a policy of extended escalation leading to an unlimited war in an "open-ended" military situation, as Senator MANSFIELD's report described it, the administration in a stabilized situation should explore realistic alternatives to escalation. As I have said so often, the conflict in Vietnam is not susceptible to a wholly military solution. It must be resolved politically and diplomatically.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
Supporting assistance

For an additional amount for "Supporting assistance", \$315,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. (Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask a question or two concerning the emergency fund of \$200 million.

Is this in the nature of a blank check to the Department of Defense or to the Executive, or what is it?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman talking about the funds for military construction or the contingency fund?

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the language as shown in the report on page 12—Secretary of Defense, \$200 million for an emergency fund.

Mr. MAHON. This is military construction. As the gentleman knows, this bill contains \$1 billion, plus, for military construction, most of which is in Vietnam. The course of the war is rather unpredictable. This is the sum of money made available in order to meet the situations as they may arise.

Mr. GROSS. Then, this is for the specific purpose of construction?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Now, how about the \$100 million for the contingency fund? This seems to be a blank check to the President.

I was disappointed in reading the hearings of the gentleman's committee on this bill in that there was no indication as to how this money is to be expended.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, it is a contingency fund. It is impossible to predict how a contingency fund will be used. It may all be used in Vietnam and some of it might be used in Africa. It might be used elsewhere. However, it is available to protect the interest of the United States in this area of activity.

I do not believe anyone can tell us how it might be used. I wish it would not be necessary to use it at all.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Texas suggested another question when he said "Africa."

Does the gentleman have any idea as to how much money has been expended from the contingency fund for the purpose of joining with the British in the outrageous boycott of Rhodesia—in other words, using contingency funds to pay for the airlifting of oil and gasoline into Zambia, which has been cut off from its normal supply through Rhodesia?

Can the gentleman from Texas bring us up to date on how many millions have been expended up to this point in financing the British boycott?

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, I am not able myself to give the gentleman the answer as to what funds may have been expended in connection with this problem.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any part of the fear that I have that through this action in which we are presently engaged—this boycott of a friendly government—we may be committing ourselves to another war, this time on the continent of Africa?

Mr. MAHON. I do not have any fear that we are committing ourselves to another war. It may be that not all of us fully support the actions with respect to Rhodesia, but this is one of the facets of our foreign policy, on which people may differ. However, the purpose of this fund is certainly not primarily for use in Africa, but to be available if necessary principally for activities associated with the war in Vietnam.

Theoretically, of course, it could be used in other places.

Mr. GROSS. Well, the contingency fund voted for the President is being used for this purpose. My question went to how much has been used and how deeply are we being committed. The Queen of England served notice as late as last week that if necessary the British would send troops to invade Rhodesia, and already we are hearing talk of the same tactics being applied to the Republic of South Africa.

Just how deeply we are being committed is a grave question that should be of concern to every American.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Iowa is himself an important member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and I assume he is familiar with this matter and could possibly give a better answer to his own question than I could.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that the Foreign Affairs Committee has just started hearings on the regular authorization bill today, and it will be my purpose to try to get full information. It is not always easy to obtain information, as the gentleman from Texas well knows, from certain individuals in this Government.

I thought, perhaps, the gentleman from Texas and his committee had developed information that I did not find in the hearings.

March 15, 1966

Mr. MAHON. I know of no plan to use these funds for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 102. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense during the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 shall be available to support Vietnamese and other Free World Forces in Vietnam and for related costs on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine: *Provided*, That unexpended balances, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, of funds heretofore allocated or transferred by the President to the Secretary of Defense for military assistance to support Vietnamese and other Free World Forces in Vietnam shall be transferred to any appropriation available to the Department of Defense for military functions (including construction), to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have several amendments to section 102 at the desk and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered as one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 8, line 3, insert "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 102."

On page 8 line 5 insert "for their stated purposes" immediately after "available".

On page 8, after line 16, insert the following:

"(b) Within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall render to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report with respect to the estimated value by purpose, by country, of support furnished from such appropriations".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make the language of the bill compatible with the language in the authorization bill which I understand was signed into law today. It undertakes to improve in a measure the actual wording of the authorization.

It tightens up and make a little clearer the intent of the Congress with respect to this matter. The language in section 102 as reported reads:

Sec. 102. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense during the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 shall be available to support Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam and for related costs on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine: *Provided*, That unexpended balances, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, of funds heretofore allocated or transferred by the President to the Secretary of Defense for military assistance to support Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam shall be transferred to any appropriation available to the Department of Defense for military functions (including construction), to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred.

When the amendment is agreed to, it will read:

Sec. 102. (a) Appropriations available to the Department of Defense during the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 shall be available for their stated purposes to support Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam and for related costs on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine: *Provided*, That unexpended balances, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, of funds heretofore allocated or transferred by the President to the Secretary of Defense for military assistance to support Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam shall be transferred to any appropriation available to the Department of Defense for military functions (including construction), to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriation to which transferred.

(b) Within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of Defense shall render to the Committee on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives a report with respect to the estimated value by purpose, by country, of support furnished from appropriations authorized to be made under this subsection.

The point is to require reports to the Congress, through the appropriate committees, within 30 days after the end of each quarter, with respect to the estimated value by purpose and by country of support furnished from these appropriations.

The basic section 102 provides that funds which would otherwise be labeled "Military Assistance" may be spent as direct military funds. To some extent, in the future, comparability of funding levels will thus be distorted for both regular military functions and military assistance. It is the purpose of this amendment to require that Congress be informed of the best estimates of the utilization of these funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The purpose of section 102, and I wonder if the gentleman agrees to this, is to provide that these funds are to be expended for the purpose for which the bill and the Congress intends that they shall be spent; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman used the words "stated purpose."

Mr. MAHON. Yes, for stated purposes such as procurement—providing certain funds for procurement—or for personnel—and otherwise to support our allies including the Vietnamese. The Vietnamese have about 850,000 men, including local police forces, under arms. This language is designed to enable our Government to support appropriately the efforts of those who fight with us.

Mr. GROSS. And that is, in Vietnam?

Mr. MAHON. In Vietnam—yes, of course.

Mr. GROSS. That is the intent?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, that is the intent.

Mr. GROSS. The intent is to support the forces—whatever they may be—there are too few there—but to support the forces in Vietnam and not somewhere else in the world?

Mr. MAHON. That is certainly the intent of this amendment.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Did the gentleman say that the reports were to come directly to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations in the House and in the Senate?

Mr. MAHON. That is with reference to the funds that are used for this purpose under the provisions of section 102.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I do not intend to raise the point, but I believe this would be subject to a point of order and is a violation of rule 40 of the House of Representatives which requires reports to come to the Speaker and to the House as a whole rather than to a specific committee. It seems to me the reports should come to the House of Representatives and to the Senate, and to the extent that they go directly to a committee and bypass the membership as a whole that the prerogatives of the Speaker of the House and of the membership as a whole are set aside. I think it is an important point although, as I say to the gentleman, I am not going to raise the point of order. But I would hope that the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services would bring their bills in, when they call for reports, with the reports to come to the Speaker and to the President pro tempore of the Senate rather than going directly to a committee.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman has made a good point. But, of course, anything that is made available to the committees is made available to the Speaker and to the Congress. What we are doing here is to tie it in with the authorization language which has already been included in the law and which is the basis for the language in the amendment.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I do not quarrel with the intent of the amendment.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has talked this over at great length with the minority. We certainly agree as to the necessity for this amendment and heartily support it.

The language of section 102 as presently contained in H.R. 13546 can readily be interpreted to give extremely wide latitude to the Secretary of Defense. The provision relates to military assistance type funds. But within the context of military assistance the present language could be interpreted to permit the merger of unexpended balances of fiscal year 1966 and prior year military assistance funds and future funds in fiscal year 1967 for South Vietnam with the accounts for military functions to be mingled between purposes. In other words the present wording of the bill was susceptible of being interpreted as unlimited transfer authority.

This provision is required because there is now no authority to use funds

March 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

appropriated to the Department of Defense for any purpose other than support of U.S. forces. Military assistance funds are now appropriated to the President and allocated to the Department of Defense.

The proposed amendment does not reject the request for authority to merge military assistance for South Vietnam with military functions but adds limiting language to that authority in two respects.

First. It limits the transfer of authority to the extent that Department of Defense appropriations for a particular purpose must be kept within that purpose. For example, personnel funds would be used for personnel, operation and maintenance for operation and maintenance, procurement for procurement, and so forth. This limitation is provided by the addition of the words, "for their stated purposes."

Second. The amendment adds a new subsection intended to assure that the Congress be kept informed on a timely basis of the use of these funds that may be made available for the support of the South Vietnamese and other free world forces under the authority granted in section 102. The amendment also states that the information be broken down by purpose and country in order to insure that the intent now expressed in section (a) be adhered to, and in the form that Congress will have the capability to oversee that it is.

There is no intent to create any condition that will prevent our troops and the troops of the free world that are assisting us from acquiring the necessary equipment and funds in a timely manner. This amendment will not jeopardize this process in the least. Its purpose is to make sure that congressional control is not diluted. The conditions as proposed in the amendment are that these fiscal transactions not violate the existing appropriations structure, it makes clear that this provision does not authorize any unlimited transfer authority, and that Congress be kept informed on a timely basis.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear to my colleagues that the gentleman from California made the suggestion with respect to this amendment. I think it is a good amendment and I am pleased to offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment and with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. WRIGHT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had

under consideration the bill (H.R. 13546) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 389, nays 3, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—389

Abbt	Cleveland	Fulton, Tenn.
Abernethy	Cleaver	Garmatz
Adams	Cohelan	Gathings
Addabbo	Colmer	Gettys
Albert	Conable	Giambo
Anderson, Ill.	Conte	Gibbons
Anderson	Cooley	Gilbert
Tenn.	Corbett	Gilligan
Andrews	Corman	Gonzalez
George W.	Craley	Grabowski
Andrews	Cramer	Gray
Glenn	Culver	Green, Oreg.
Andrews	Cunningham	Green, Pa.
N. Dak.	Curtin	Greig
Annunzio	Curtis	Grider
Arends	Daddario	Griffin
Ashbrook	Dague	Griffiths
Ashley	Dantels	Gross
Ashmore	Davis, Wis.	Grover
Aspinall	Dawson	Gubser
Ayres	de la Garza	Gurney
Bandstra	Delaney	Hagan, Ga.
Barrett	Dent	Haley
Bates	Denton	Hall
Battin	Derwinski	Halpern
Bekworth	Diggs	Hamilton
Beicher	Dingell	Dinkinson
Bennett	Dole	Hanley
Berry	Donohue	Hanna
Betts	Dorn	Hansen, Idaho
Bingham	Dow	Hansen, Iowa
Blatnik	Dulski	Hansen, Wash.
Boggs	Duncan, Oreg.	Hardy
Boland	Duncan, Tenn.	Harsha
Boitton	Dwyer	Harvey, Mich.
Bow	Dyal	Hathaway
Brademas	Edmondson	Hawkins
Bray	Edwards, Ala.	Hays
Brooks	Edwards, Calif.	Hébert
Broomfield	Edwards, La.	Hechler
Brown, Ohio	Erlenborn	Helstoski
Broyhill, N.C.	Evans, Colo.	Henderson
Broyhill, Va.	Everett	Herlong
Buchanan	Evins, Tenn.	Hicks
Burke	Fallon	Hollifield
Burleson	Farbstein	Holland
Burton, Utah	Farnesley	Horton
Byrne, Pa.	Farnum	Hosmer
Byrnes, Wis.	Fasell	Howard
Cabell	Feighan	Hull
Cahill	Findley	Hungate
Callan	Fino	Huot
Callaway	Flood	Hutchinson
Cameron	Flynt	Ichord
Carey	Fogarty	Irwin
Carter	Foley	Jacobs
Casey	Ford, Gerald R.	Jarman
Cederberg	Ford	Jennings
Celler	William D.	Joelson
Chamberlain	Fountain	Johnson, Calif.
Chelf	Fraser	Johnson, Okla.
Clancy	Frelighuysen	Johnson, Pa.
Clark	Friedel	Jones
Clausen	Fulton, Pa.	Jones, Ala.
Don H.		Jones, Mo.
		Jones, N.C.

Kasten	Natcher	Selden
Kath	Nedzi	Senner
Kastenmeier	Nelsen	Shipey
Kee	Nix	Shriver
Keith	O'Brien	Sickles
Kelly	O'Hara, Ill.	Sikes
Keogh	O'Hara, Mich.	Skubitz
King, Calif.	O'Konski	Slack
King, N.Y.	Olsen, Mont.	Smith, Calif.
King, Utah	Olson, Minn.	Smith, Iowa
Kirwan	O'Neal, Ga.	Smith, N.Y.
Kluczynski	O'Neill, Mass.	Smith, Va.
Kornegay	Ottinger	Springer
Krebs	Passman	Stafford
Kunkel	Patman	Staggers
Kupferman	Patten	Stalbaum
Laird	Pelly	Stanton
Landrum	Pepper	Steed
Langen	Perkins	Stephens
Latta	Philbin	Stratton
Leggett	Pickle	Stubblefield
Lennon	Pike	Sullivan
Lipscomb	Plrnie	Sweeney
Long, La.	Poage	Talcott
Long, Md.	Poff	Taylor
Love	Pool	Teague, Calif.
McCarthy	Pucinski	Tenzer
McClary	Purcell	Thompson, N.J.
McCulloch	Quile	Thompson, Tex.
McDade	Quillen	Thomson, Wis.
McDowell	Race	Todd
McEwen	Randall	Trimble
McFall	Redlin	Tuck
McGrath	Rees	Tunney
McMillan	Reid, Ill.	Tupper
Macdonald	Reid, N.Y.	Tuten
MacGregor	Reifel	Udall
Machen	Reuss	Ullman
Mackie	Rhodes, Ariz.	Utt
Madden	Rhodes, Pa.	Van Deerlin
Mahon	Rivers, S.C.	Vank
Mailhard	Rivers, Alaska	Vigorito
Marsh	Roberts	Vivian
Martin, Nebr.	Robison	Waggonner
Matsunaga	Rodino	Walker, N. Mex.
May	Rogers, Colo.	Watkins
Meeds	Rogers, Fla.	Watson
Michel	Rogers, Tex.	Watts
Miller	Ronan	Weltner
Mills	Rooney, N.Y.	Whalley
Minish	Rooney, Pa.	White, Idaho
Mink	Rosenthal	White, Tex.
Minshall	Rostenkowski	Whitener
Mize	Roush	Whitten
Moeller	Roybal	Whitnall
Monagan	Rumsfeld	Williams
Moorhead	Satterfield	Wilson, Bob
Morgan	St Germain	Wilson,
Morris	St. Onge	Charles H.
Morrison	Saylor	Wolf
Morse	Scheuer	Wright
Morton	Schisler	Wyatt
Moss	Schmidhauser	Wyder
Multer	Schneebeli	Yates
Murphy, Ill.	Schwelker	Young
Murphy, N.Y.	Scott	Younger
Murray	Secrest	Zablocki

NAYS—3

Burton, Calif. Conyers Ryan

NOT VOTING—39

Adair	Fisher	Moore
Baring	Fuqua	Mosher
Bell	Gallagher	Powell
Bolling	Goodell	Price
Brock	Hagen, Calif.	Reinecke
Brown, Calif.	Halleck	Resnick
Clawson, Del.	Harvey, Ind.	Roncalio
Collier	McVicker	Roudebush
Davis, Ga.	Mackay	Sisk
Devine	Martin, Ala.	Teague, Tex.
Dowdy	Martin, Mass.	Toll
Downing	Mathias	Walker, Miss.
Ellsworth	Matthews	Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Mathias.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Downing with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
 Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Reinecke.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Ellsworth.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Price with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Matthews with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
 Mr. Mackay with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Goodell,
Mr. Willis with Mr. Devine,
Mr. McVicker with Mr. Martin of Alabama,
Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Brock,
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Mosher,
Mr. Powell with Mr. Roncalio,
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Del Clawson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members speaking on the bill just passed may revise and extend their remarks and include pertinent extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF HON. CARL ALBERT, REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 779

Resolved, That Hon. CARL ALBERT, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Resolved, That the President and the Senate be notified by the Clerk of the election of the Honorable CARL ALBERT as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to mention that this resolution is being offered at the request of the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. ALBERT assumed the Chair and the oath of office was administered to him by Mr. CELLER, a Representative from the State of New York.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SUPPLEMENTAL FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further

the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1328)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
EDNA F. KELLY,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,
PETER H. B. FREILINGHUYSEN,
WM. BROOMFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, report that the accompanying conference report recommends that the Senate recede from its amendments.

The managers on the part of the House pointed out that the amendment before the committee of conference dealt with matters which had not received consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs during its consideration of the bill nor had there been any discussion during debate in the House, but they recognized that this question deserved careful consideration. Because there has not been adequate opportunity to review in detail the full impact of the Senate provision, the managers on the part of the House were unwilling to accept the Senate language, but they agreed that the Committee on Foreign Affairs should look into the whole question during the consideration of the pending foreign aid bill.

In view of the general feeling that hearings should be held on this whole question, the managers on the part of the Senate receded.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
EDNA F. KELLY,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,
PETER H. B. FREILINGHUYSEN,
WM. BROOMFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12752) entitled "An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes."

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to provide for the Surgeon General, with the approval of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to establish in the Public Health Service a National Eye Institute for the conduct and support of research and training relating to blinding eye diseases and visual disorders, including research and training in special health problems relating to the mechanism of sight and visual function.

Surveys disclosed blindness ranks second to cancer as the affliction most feared by American people, more so than heart disease, polio, and tuberculosis or loss of limbs.

More than 1 million Americans over 40 have glaucoma, these being prime targets for eventual blindness. Most of them have never heard of the disease. More than 10 million throughout the world are totally blind.

One million Americans cannot read ordinary newspaper type with the aid of glasses, while 1½ million are blind in one eye.

Ninety million Americans suffer from ocular malfunction.

The National Health Education Committee discloses that incidence of cataract among people age 60 is nearly 60 percent, at age 80 almost 100 percent.

A Gallup survey disclosed that one out of five people have no idea what a cataract is, and even the most educated have only a vague conception of what is involved in this disease. OLSEN stated lack of public knowledge results from the fact so little has been done in the field of eye research.

More than 80 percent of all loss of vision in the United States results from diseases whose causes are unknown to science. Five percent are the result of accidents.

Visual disorders constitute one of the Nation's leading causes of disability. One-tenth of all patients seen in American hospitals are eye patients.

In 1963 the cost of caring for the blind was more than \$1 billion. Moneys invested in eye research by both Government and private sources amounted to \$3 million that same year.

SOUTH VIETNAMESE EXECUTION

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, a grave travesty on justice has been perpetrated by the Government of South Vietnam in the name of social and economic reform. The public justification for this execution was, and I quote yesterday's Washington Post; to fulfill Ky's pledge to President Johnson at the Honolulu Conference to put South Vietnam's social and economic house in order." For all the influence that we have on this regime, we did nothing to stop this senseless public execution which makes a mockery of our whole system of justice.

Out of the Honolulu Conference came a display of unity of purpose of our two

March 15, 1966

Governments. There was renewed good will in the joint resolve and reaffirmation to help the people of South Vietnam succeed in their own efforts to secure a better life, but this recent spectacular exhibit of totalitarian edict to secure certain ends points to the vastly different worlds we truly live in.

General Ky's goals and ours may be the same, but can we, in the eyes of the Asians whom we seek to influence and to save from communism, embrace his methods of the firing squad by our silence and our acquiescence?

I urge the President and the Vice President to quickly intercede to prevent these extreme measures from becoming the means by which all of his social and economic problems are solved.

Lest we make a mockery of our valiant and tragic sacrifice of the lives of our American youth who need to have complete faith in the integrity of the South Vietnamese Government, we must forcefully insist that its leadership understand and apply to its own people the same moral and ethical code of conduct that has caused our American soldiers to give their lives for the sake of the ideals of a democratic society.

This barbaric act must not be allowed to be repeated. To accept this kind of a solution to an economic phenomenon is to invite the easy road to ultimate ruin without treating the cause at all. A thousand executed profiteers will not buy a stable economy or a new social order.

THE 118TH ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with special pride that I speak today on the 118th anniversary of the Hungarian uprising for liberty against the Hapsburg dynasty.

It is special for several reasons.

It is special because my dear friend of many years, Bishop Zoltan Beky, president of the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, delivered the beautiful and moving prayer heard this noon in the House of Representatives.

It is special because people who love and cherish freedom throughout the world have a particular respect for the Hungarian people. They have always been champions of liberty.

And it is also special because one of the greatest fighters and leaders that freedom ever had—Louis Kossuth—inspired the Hungarian revolution for freedom we are observing today.

These revolutionaries for freedom were successful in their fight against tyranny and Louis Kossuth became head of the Government. But their freedom did not endure and the revolution was overthrown by the Hapsburg dynasty.

After Kossuth fled to Turkey, he later visited the United States, where he received many honors as a hero of freedom.

Judging not only from his deeds, but from the words of praise that came from some of America's greatest men, Louis Kossuth was indeed great.

Greeting him at Concord, Ralph Waldo

Emerson called Kossuth, "Freedom's angel."

Horace Greeley, another literary immortal, said of Kossuth:

Of the many popular leaders who were upheaved by the great convulsions of 1848 into the full sunlight of European celebrity and American popular regard, the world has already definitely assigned the first rank to Louis Kossuth, advocate, deputy, finance minister, and finally Governor of Hungary.

Whittier lauded him as "the noblest guest."

And as we near recent history, we note that Woodrow Wilson in 1918 praised Kossuth and said:

I know the history of the gallant Magyar nation.

Tribute was not restricted to Americans of renown. The famous English economist and statesman Cobden declared:

Kossuth is certainly a phenomenon: he is not only the first orator of his age, but he unites the qualities of a great administrator with high morality and an indefatigable courage.

Because he loved freedom so deeply, Kossuth recognized despotism and always fought it vigorously—with sword and pen. As far back as October 27, 1851, he observed:

The principle of evil on the Continent is the despotic and encroaching spirit of the Russian power. Russia is the rock which breaks every sigh for freedom.

Louis Kossuth knew the threat of Russia even then but he also knew the promise of America. For about 116 years ago, he warned a gathering in Massachusetts that, "From Russia, no sun will ever rise."

But he had faith in America's purpose and dream, for he also told that group:

To find the sunlight where it most spreads and lightens the path of freedom, we must come to America.

In 1852, Kossuth was presented to the United States Senate and also to the House of Representatives. He did not speak long, but, as always, spoke with eloquence. He said:

It is remarkable that while in the history of mankind, through all the past, honors were bestowed upon glory, and glory was attached only to success, the legislative authorities of this great Republic bestow the highest honors upon a persecuted exile, not conspicuous by glory, nor favored by success, but engaged in a just cause. There is a triumph of republican principles in this fact.

Later, Louis Kossuth, in heavy demand as a brilliant speaker, gave almost 300 public addresses, all unforgettable.

Mr. Speaker, on this day of tribute to the Hungarian people, it is hard to conclude, because our hearts and thoughts are full of gratitude and love.

Since Louis Kossuth will always be the symbol of the courageous and freedom-loving Hungarian people, I would like to quote from the poem written by James Russell Lowell, named "Kossuth."

Land of the Magyars, though it be
The tyrant may relink his chain,
Already thine the victory,
As just future measures gain.
Thou hast succeeded, thou hast won
The deathly travail's amplest worth,
A nation's duty thou hast done,
Giving a hero to our earth.

And Daniel Webster delivered an address of welcome to Louis Kossuth on January 5, 1852. His words express the feelings I have for the Hungarian people on this day of remembrance—and I believe the feelings of many of my colleagues. Said Webster:

Hungary stands out far above her neighbors in all that respects free institutions, constitutional government and a hereditary love of liberty.

How true these words are even 114 years later.

The free world will always remember and admire the courage of the Hungarian people in 1956, when they rebelled against the tyranny of communism. Their courage was an inspiration to the entire world.

I visited Hungary last November and I observed with my own eyes that the people there have no freedom under communism. Russian soldiers with machine guns make the whole country a jail. The people seem lethargic—almost as if life is not worth living.

Mr. Speaker, on the 118th anniversary of the Hungarian uprising for liberty, let us pray to God that once again—soon—Hungary will be free.

OREGON COUNTY, MO., MOVES AHEAD WITH NEW CONSERVATION DISTRICT

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this month the Missouri State Soil and Water Conservation Districts Commission authorized the people of Oregon County to move ahead in the protection and sound development of their soil and water resources by approving a soil and water conservation district for that county. This action resulted from a referendum in which the people of Oregon County voted for a conservation district. Incidentally, this vote of approval was 382 to 20.

I have been extremely pleased with the stepped-up interest in soil and water conservation districts in Missouri. Thirty-one have been formed in the last 6 years, accounting for nearly half of the 68 that have been formed since 1944. I believe that this indicates recognition of the benefits of sound conservation and development. I believe that it also indicates recognition of the value of the district mechanism through which the Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies can channel help to rural individuals and communities. It is a healthy trend and I hope will continue.

Conservation districts have proved to be a sound way for communities to work together and plan for not just the present but for the long-term needs of the community. Their objectives to manage the land and water resources soundly while developing them assures a community of resources that will remain an asset for future economic growth. The reasons for supporting this vital conservation movement are valid—whether viewed from the point of the care of resources themselves, or whether from the point of the economic value these resources have in the community.

March 15, 1966

The congressional district which I represent—in which this new conservation district is located—is a highly productive area and represents a large part of the agricultural income of the State. I have observed some of the conservation work that local people have done to overcome water management and flood problems. Some of these problems the individual farmer can handle by himself. Many require broader technical assistance such as is available through soil and water conservation districts. Many of the resource problems are of a community nature where a group approach is required. Here again, the conservation district provides coordinated action. Its farsighted and comprehensive resource inventories and programs are responsive to the needs and desires of the community because they are planned and carried out by local people. I commend soil and water conservation districts for the vital role they have taken in community development and I am gratified that Oregon County has joined their ranks, and am hopeful that the few remaining counties in the 10th district which do not have soil conservation districts will give serious consideration to the benefits which they might derive from the creation of such districts.

OPPORTUNITY CRUSADE

(Mr. GOODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, hearings are now underway on the poverty program. Congressman QUIE and I are pressing for consideration of our proposal to substitute an opportunity crusade for the misfiring war on poverty. Last week, Mr. Shriver testified rather superficially on a variety of issues. Among other things, in his prepared testimony, he made the incredible statement:

Since last summer fewer than 50 ineligibles have been discovered in the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

The very next day, Secretary Wirtz contradicted Mr. Shriver by admitting that at least 5,000 to 6,000 enrollees in the Neighborhood Youth Corps have been found ineligible and dropped since last summer; 1,700 were dropped in Chicago alone since January 1. Now they are saying that these are welfare cases, barely exceeding the strict poverty standards. Well, a quick spot check of widely dispersed records in Chicago gives quite a different picture. Although arbitrary handling of the hearings prevented me from questioning Mr. Shriver on these, here are some samples. I have removed the names of the enrollees to spare them embarrassment; however, they are available to officials who may be interested:

Male enrollee, 17, family of four, father head of household, income \$11,000 a year.

Male enrollee, 19, family of five, father head of household, income \$10,200 a year.

Female enrollee, 19, family of two—housewife with no children—husband head of household, income \$5,000—plus a year.

Female enrollee, 18, family of three—an only child—father and mother both work, earn jointly \$150 per week.

Female enrollee, 20, family of three—an only child—father head of household, income \$7,500 a year.

Male enrollee, 17, family of six, father head of household, income \$7,000—plus a year.

Male enrollee, 19, family of five, grandfather head of household, income \$7,000—plus a year.

Male enrollee, 18, family of six, father and mother both work, earn jointly \$500 a month.

Male enrollee, 20, family of five, father head of household, income \$5,400 a year.

This is the program supposed to help poor youngsters who are school dropouts or likely dropouts for reasons of poverty. Obviously, a full investigation would reveal many times more than Mr. Shriver's 50 ineligibles in Chicago alone. And no wonder. Last November the public relations representative for the Chicago poverty program stated:

We don't know what the families of kids make. No straight flat figure on what an applicant family should make has been set. We have no statistics on incomes of the families of the kids in the Corps. We assume that, when we receive a name from the Illinois State Employment Service, the candidate named is qualified.

At that time, the executive director of the Chicago program was quoted as follows:

It is absolutely correct that, until today, no means test was given in recruiting.

Almost one-quarter of the total enrollees in Neighborhood Youth Corps in Chicago had to be dropped because they exceeded the income requirement. At the same time, the poverty director in Chicago admits that there are at least 35,000, and others estimate up to 60,000, young people between the ages of 16 and 22 in Chicago who fully meet the poverty standards for Neighborhood Youth Corps but weren't given a chance.

Mr. Speaker, these are not isolated cases; they prevail all over the country. In addition to the 1,700 dropped in Chicago, Mr. Jack Howard, director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, admitted that about 2,000 in New York City and at least 1,000 in Los Angeles were ineligible. That is close to 5,000 ineligibles from three cities alone.

In the next few days, I will discuss other serious violations in the poverty program in Chicago. In the meanwhile, let me emphasize that the QUIE-Goodell opportunity crusade would correct these deficiencies and put 50,000 youngsters into productive jobs in private enterprise through a new Industry Youth Corps.

DEFENDING FREEDOM WITH FREEDOM

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last month Roger M. Blough, chairman of the

board, United States Steel Corp., and a native of my hometown, delivered an address at the Founders Day Banquet of Washington University in St. Louis, Mo. Since a portion of it deals with the fiscal responsibilities of Congress, I commend Mr. Blough's presentation to my colleagues.

Without question, lack of restraint on the part of the administration in requesting appropriations and lack of restraint on the part of Congress in making such funds available are the major provocations in an inflationary trend. They are the principal impediments to holding onto the value of our money.

Providing the finest equipment and tools of war is the topmost consideration at this time. As Mr. Blough has established, however, this cost has not reached a point where it can be tagged as the sole reason for the growing excess of Federal expenditures over Federal income. The real culprit is bureaucratic waste, and it cannot be tolerated if Congress has any intention of holding the line against the destructive forces of inflation.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Blough's address appears herewith:

Founders day in any university provides a welcome opportunity to indulge in recollections of past achievements. It serves to recall the humble beginnings of what, in this case, has proven to be a monumental educational venture that was undertaken more than a century ago. Everyone associated with Washington University may well be proud of its history, its traditions, and of its past performance which weighs so heavily as a promise for the future.

People have come to expect great things of this university and of its graduates; and if I do not dwell, tonight, upon the commendable degree to which these expectations have been fulfilled, it is only because I am understandably reluctant to do anything which might contribute to inflation—even of the ego.

But founders day, as you observe it on this campus, has a current purpose which transcends the mere recognition of a fine and noble tradition. It provides a unique occasion to contemplate contemporary issues of mounting importance. Many of you will recall that last year, the Chief Justice of the United States discussed with you the "foundations of freedom" as those foundations are imbedded in the law, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. And in doing so, he shed much penetrating light upon an issue of profound importance to the future of this Nation.

Tonight, I should like to consider with you another aspect of freedom which seems to me to be of imminent importance and which certainly touches the lives of all of us. It concerns the preservation of economic freedom in America while we seek to defend the political freedom of other peoples throughout the world.

As we meet here, we are confronted by the fact that despite prodigious efforts to reach a negotiated peace, our Nation is engaged in what might—if you wish—he called a negotiated war. Two hundred thousand American men are now fighting in Vietnam. Each month, some thousands of others are receiving their "greetings" from Uncle Sam. And present indications are that before the year is out the number of American troops engaged in this conflict will have more than doubled.

So for the fourth time in this century, American youth has answered the call to repel aggression in foreign lands, to protect

March 15, 1966

a foreign people against subjugation, infiltration, and subversion, and to help them find a solution to their own problems.

In this effort our men are heavily handicapped by a jungle-type existence, by a climate and terrain that is alien to anything they have known, by extended supply lines reaching halfway around the world, by inadequate help from most of the other free nations, and by extreme barriers to understanding.

Meanwhile, among our people here at home, there are some who question vehemently the necessity, the wisdom or even the morality of our involvement in this war. And this, too, is an exercise of freedom that few of us would seek to deny, I suppose, however deeply we may disagree with such expressions.

But there is one basic point, I believe, upon which true Americans can never disagree: That everything needed to protect the lives of our soldiers in Vietnam shall be provided to the limit of our national resources, both material and human. If the sacrifice of economic freedom will, in fact, hasten the winning of the peace in Vietnam and reduce our casualties there, there can hardly be any loyal opposition to such a sacrifice. But if, on the other hand, the economic freedoms which have made this Nation the most productive in the world are—as I believe them to be—a unique source of our military and economic strength, then we should, and must, defend and preserve them in the national interest.

In short, the question before us is: To what degree may we assist in the fight for freedom by relying upon freedom—freedom in production, freedom to buy and sell, and freedom in occupation? Or must we revert to wartime types of wage controls, or price controls, material controls and even controls of movement among occupations in order, as a nation, to wage the defense of freedom?

The question is a grave one; and it is none too early to explore it now in the cool, unemotional light of reason and fact; for the good sense and the patriotic endeavors of the American people will have much to do with determining its solution. What the people think, and what they say to their Representatives in Congress, is certain to influence the final decision since eventually—under our system of laws—Congress must make that decision.

Let us consider, then, three aspects of this question. Do the pressures generated by the war in Vietnam, plus those created by a rapidly growing economy, make controls necessary now or in the foreseeable future? Do the economic disruptions caused by controls themselves negate or outweigh the benefits to be expected from them? Are other, less disruptive means available for use in dealing with these pressures?

Turning first to the question of necessity, we recall that in World War II and again during the Korean conflict controls were imposed upon production, distribution, wages and prices in order to channel the necessary portion of our Gross National Product into the war effort. How then do conditions today compare with those that existed before?

Well, at the peak of World War II, defense expenditures averaged about \$84 billion a year and exceeded 40 percent of the total GNP. At the height of the Korean war, they were almost \$49 billion and accounted for 13½ percent of the GNP. Last year they amounted to \$50 billion; but they represented only 7½ percent of the GNP. That is because the GNP itself has more than trebled since World War II, and has nearly doubled since the peak Korean year of 1953.

During the present year it is estimated that our total defense expenditures may rise to \$60 billion which would still be less than 8½ percent of the anticipated GNP; and they

would have to mount to an astronomical \$100 billion in order to reach the 13½ percent rate that prevailed at the height of the Korean war. That is far beyond any projected requirement of the action in Vietnam.

As for manpower, it must be noted here also that the national labor force has substantially increased in numbers during the past 20 years.

At the end of World War II, there were 11,500,000 men in our Armed Forces—or 17½ percent of the total labor supply. During Korea, there were 3,500,000 men in the military, representing over 5 percent of the labor force; and about 475,000 of these were actually engaged in Korea.

Last year, some 2,800,000 men were in the armed forces and this accounted for only 3.6 percent of the labor supply. Future requirements, as presently projected, could call for an additional 300,000 men in the services; but even if that number were to rise to 500,000, the military drain on the national labor force would amount to only about 4 percent as compared to more than 5 percent during the Korean conflict.

And as for Vietnam itself, the 200,000 men now stationed there constitute only one-fourth of 1 percent of our national labor supply; and President Johnson reports that the total production of goods and services for the war "accounts for less than 1½ percent of our gross national product."

So it is evident, I think, that Vietnam is not the primary source of the economic pressures we are experiencing. Vietnam may provide an excuse for the advocacy of controls. But it is not a reason for them; and if we seek out the major cause of these pressures, we must look to the unusually rapid rate of our economic growth in the non-military areas.

Last year, the American economy grew at a greater rate than that of any other major industrial nation in the world. After correcting for rising prices, the real rate of growth was 5½ percent; and all of this new activity increased the demand for manpower, and the upward pressure on wages and prices.

During the 1960's, the expansion of the supply of money and credit has been at twice the rate prevailing in the late 1950's. Government expenditures at all levels—Federal, State, and local—have increased 65 percent since Korea even though there has been no appreciable rise in military outlays. Thus virtually all of this increase has occurred on the nondefense side of the ledger.

As a result, a head of economic steam is building up to a point which is beginning to cause national concern lest it break out in a burst of rising wages and prices. And this concern is understandable at a time when we are confronted by a stubbornly continuing imbalance of international payments, a worrisome outflow of our dwindling gold supply, the need to widen the narrowing gap in our favorable balance of trade, and the necessity of preserving the integrity of the dollar as a medium of international exchange.

Trying to find out how long we can contain this mounting head of steam while continuing to heat up the boiler is something like playing Russian roulette. Certainly we cannot continue indefinitely no matter how hard we try to hold back the hand on the pressure gauge. For the present we are pinning our faith upon the willingness and the ability of both industry and labor to comply voluntarily with the governmental guideposts established some years ago; and while a considerable degree of price stability has been achieved during this period—especially in the more visible industries where a certain amount of "persuasion" could be applied—the boiler is clearly beginning to leak.

For the entire nongovernmental sector of the economy, employee compensation per man-hour has risen more than output per

man-hour in each of the past 3 years; so unit labor costs have kept mounting. Across the economy generally, labor settlements last year exceeded the guidepost limits of 3.2 percent; and a recent release by the Department of Labor reports that in the construction industry, for example, wages and benefits rose 4.8 percent during the past fiscal year, while their study of a limited number of these labor contracts negotiated in 1965 revealed increases averaging 6.1 percent and ranging up to 8.3 percent.

Under the pressure of these rising costs and of the increased economic activity generally, the Consumer Price Index has risen 11 percent since 1957-59, and the tempo has accelerated recently. In fact I might add, parenthetically, that during the 7 years since the end of 1958, the cost of living has gone up about six times as much as the price of finished steel. But I mention that only in passing.

Further energizing this trend toward higher wages and consequent rising prices is the fact that we now have practically full employment, and there is an actual shortage of skilled workers. Only about 4 percent of the labor force is presently classified as unemployed, and the Council of Economic Advisers reports that this figure will drop to 3¼ percent for the current year and will be well below that level at year's end. Among married men, unemployment is now down to 2 percent and is still declining.

Under all of these circumstances, it will clearly become increasingly difficult to maintain an acceptable degree of wage and price stability through the publication of guideposts and the powers of Presidential persuasion; and the question arises: "What next?"

So the situation that confronts us today is much like that which prevailed at the end of 1950, when the United States had started down the road to wage and price controls. Then, as now, the road was paved with requests for a voluntary freeze; and standards for the freeze were being drawn up. Under the pressures of that day, the prices of many products were rising; and the prospect of price control, itself, added greatly to these pressures as producers and merchants sought to cover their rising costs before the freeze hit them. Production shifted from lower price lines to more expensive, and more profitable goods; and retailers built their inventories to a record high, thus adding to demand in an already overheated economy.

But before we travel that road again, let us stop, look, and listen, for it is one thing to talk of controls and quite another thing to survive them. There is no doubt that for a limited period they can and do hold down the lid on prices. There is also no doubt, however, that they create scarcity and thus add to the economic pressures that caused their adoption in the first place. Some of us whose memory goes back to the controls of 20 years ago will recall the butter that was sold from under the counter to favored customers, and the deterioration in the quality of merchandise that occurred as producers and merchants were often forced—at the peril of their own survival—to pay higher-than-ceiling prices on purchases in order to get the materials to keep their businesses running.

Then, too, there is a wasteful deployment of manpower at a time when a shortage of manpower already exists. Under the normal operation of a free market, the people themselves—as buyers—determine what manpower will be allocated to what production. If they do not choose to buy a certain product, then that product will no longer be made and the manpower will go elsewhere to produce what is wanted and needed.

Controls not only wipe out this self-adjusting, competitive mechanism, but—by their almost unbelievable complexity—they

March 15, 1966

create enormous new manpower demands in the administration and the application of the regulations.

To illustrate, let me recall that during the Korean war, United States Steel's operations were under control by eight different Federal agencies, the most important of which were the National Production Authority and the Office of Price Stabilization.

Regulations and directives of the National Production Authority aggregated about 300,000 words and underwent approximately 400 amendments, supplements, revocations, and directions.

The Office of Price Stabilization issued 37 different regulations applying to our business. One ceiling price regulation alone consisted of almost 30,000 words and was amended 41 times with 20 supplemental regulations. So estimate if you can the number of accountants, lawyers, engineers, and others required to keep up with these regulations; expand that to cover all the businesses in the country, big and small; add the thousands employed in the administration of these controls on the Government side, and you come up with some idea, at least, of the great wastage of manpower that is inherent in the mere application of controls themselves.

But, you may ask, can the Defense Department—in the absence of controls—get what it needs to carry on its military efforts? The answer is that it can and it does. We already have a system of priorities under which Defense has first claim on essential production.

But will not the Government have to pay more than it should? And the answer to that is also simple; for the Government is the sole buyer of war material while there are many sellers competing for its business. Thus we have the opposite of a monopoly—a monopsony. And as a monopsony, the Government imposes conditions of purchase under which it exercises the right to renegotiate contracts and to reclaim an adjudicated part of the purchase price if the profits on the sale are deemed too large.

But then, you may ask, how about the average fellow, the pensioner, or widow living on a fixed income. Without controls, is there any better way of keeping prices from skyrocketing? And here, I can only think of the ardent young suitor whose proposal of marriage had been firmly rejected by the girl of his dreams.

"Tell me," he pleaded, "is there anyone else?"

"Oh, Elmer," she replied, "there must be."

So it is with controls. There must be better solutions; and I believe that there are.

In the first place we must recognize that our productive capacity in America is expanding substantially every year; so there is an ever-increasing supply of goods and services to meet our Nation's demands, both military and civilian.

The President has called upon business to exercise restraint in its pricing policies; and has asked labor unions to keep their demands within certain bounds. Here it must be said that the two problems are somewhat different. Among businesses there is a high degree of competition which tends to repress prices; but among unions there is also a high degree of competition—more in the nature of political competition—which tends conversely to escalate wages.

For example, transit workers in New York recently won wage and benefit increases far in excess of guideline limits; and now it is announced that the New York City Police will seek pay boosts that will also shatter the guidelines concept.

It goes without saying that among labor unions you will find just as many patriotic and dedicated men as in any other segment of our society. These men, however, have a real problem. They feel compelled by force of circumstance to demand "more" in behalf of the individuals they represent. That is

their function and their job; and it is asking much of them when they are called upon to exercise restraint.

Similarly it is the inescapable obligation of business managers to keep their enterprises healthy and to generate the profit necessary to keep America's industrial facilities modern and competitive—not only in the interest of the owners but in the national interest as well. So there must be some wage and price flexibility to accommodate the myriad changes that occur from day to day. Yet I believe that the wiser heads in the leadership of both labor and business will recognize that the exercise of restraint in the highest possible degree is imperative at a time when the probable alternatives are rising costs and runaway prices or disruptive controls.

But restraint is not a one-way street, and no matter how diligently and patriotically business and labor may try to plug the leaks in the economic boiler, they cannot succeed unless someone stops pouring on the coal. And that, I believe, is where Congress comes in. On the monetary side, the Federal Reserve Board is authorized and equipped to retard the expansion of currency and credit; and I would not anticipate that Congress would seek to oppose the necessary exercise of these powers.

On the fiscal side, Congress can ease the pressure by the judicious use of taxation; and the President has already recommended the reinstatement of certain excise taxes and a speed-up in the payments of personal and corporate income taxes.

But it is in the area of restraint in appropriations and other legislation that the hard-working men on the Hill face both their most difficult problems and their greatest opportunity to prevent a further heating up of the economy; for it is they who control the purse strings.

Today we dream of an America where there will be no slums, no pockets of poverty, no illiterates, no unemployed, no discrimination, no lack of medical facilities for all, and a minimum of crime. And, being Americans, we are impatient to reach those shining goals—which is as it should be. But excessive impatience at a time of great economic pressure can be disastrous and produce the wage and price explosion which neither guideposts nor controls can permanently prevent. And it is up to all of us to recognize that we cannot have what I call instant affluence.

Certainly it should be possible to defer a number of programs which call for pouring of additional dollars into the economy from Government sources, however meritorious those programs might be under other circumstances.

Is it necessary, for example, to press forward with make-work types of projects at a time when manpower is already scarce and growing scarcer?

Is this a time to undertake other large governmental expenditures which will divert manpower from more immediately necessary production? No one discounts the value of training the youth of this Nation and providing jobs for them; but is it not better for them to be trained on the job while earning their own keep and doing useful work? And does not the growing shortage of skilled workers create new opportunities for the unskilled to acquire skills?

Then, too, is this the year to enact, for example, a law increasing the minimum wage by 40 percent, and at the same time talk about a 3.2-percent limit on increases under the guidelines? Will this not tend to elevate the entire wage structure when the increased social security and medicare taxes that went into effect last month have already added at least two-thirds of a percent to employment costs generally—an addition, incidentally, which the guidelines do not take into account?

Is 1966 the year in which to federalize unemployment compensation by legislation that will add still further to the cost of employment in hundreds of corporations all over the country?

In short, is this the time to enact—in the name of social progress—far-reaching programs that are costly, inadequately managed because of the lack of trained manpower, and in many instances designed to correct situations that the present economic buildup is already tending to correct without governmental intervention?

The answer is up to the Members of Congress. It is their prerogative to authorize expenditures. It is their obligation to view the economic picture as a whole and act in their own best wisdom.

Summing up, then, this is a plea for recognizing where we are as a nation—a nation which necessarily must meet its commitments abroad and maintain its economic strength at home.

It is a plea for practical restraint by both business and labor.

It is equally a plea for restraint on the part of Congress which will finally determine the extent of the pressures unleashed in our economic system.

It is even more a plea to recognize that the most effective way to help our Government achieve its purposes is not through the imposition of controls—and that even the suggestion of controls breeds apprehensions which induce scare buying and, in turn, increase the upward tendency of wages and prices.

Above all, this is a plea to recognize the free market economy for what it is: the most efficient, productive source of our material freedom; and to acknowledge that interference with the markets operation leads to inefficiency, inequity, and to shortages.

In a word, it is a plea to defend freedom with freedom.

ANNOUNCEMENT

(Mr. FISHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on the vote which was just concluded on the appropriation bill I was unavoidably detained and arrived in the Chamber immediately after the conclusion of the vote. I should like to announce that had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE ARMY ARSENAL SYSTEM AND THE SPRINGFIELD ARMORY—NO. II

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman CONTE, and I addressed the House for the purpose of bringing to the attention of Congress the extreme seriousness, to the security of this country, of current steps being taken by the Department of Defense and the Army toward closing out all operations and facilities at the Springfield Armory.

Today, we are providing more basic information in opposition to this most inadvisable and fateful decision on the part of the Secretary of Defense. It is a decision which, in our opinion, gambles—first in the name of disproved cost reduction and now in the name of private enterprise—with the long-range security

Cleveland Trust; Arthur W. Steudel, chairman of Sherwin-Williams Co.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, Feb. 18, 1966]

THE BANK EXAMINERS

If the special bank investigating committee created by the 1965 legislature has the best interest of all Ohio in mind, there will be no whitewash of any bank practice, nor of any particular bank or banks.

Under its chairman, State Senator Charles W. Whalen, Jr., of Dayton, the committee has opened its hearings in Columbus. The legislator responsible for its creation—Senator Oliver Ocasek—was not shown the courtesy of being named to the committee.

But Ocasek has said he will be present. Certainly the committee can do no less than hear him explain in detail just why he believed Ohio needed such a probe into its State-chartered banks at this time.

If he suggests, as he has indicated he would, that there are dangerous signs of extreme concentration of power in State banking circles, then let's see if such concern is justified.

The banking community of Ohio is in need of no whitewash. It is sound enough to take without a quiver a searching examination into its methods of operation—and its interlocking interests.

We in Cleveland, home of the State's largest banking institution—the Cleveland Trust Co.—will be watching the work of this committee with great interest.

[From the Cleveland Press, Feb. 17, 1966]

BANK'S CHIEF SKIPS LEGISLATURE'S HEARING (By Gordon C. Raeburn)

COLUMBUS.—The first legislative study of Ohio's banking laws and regulations since 1933 is off to a slow start because of the State commerce department's division of banks.

The six senators and nine representatives wanted to discuss the State's problems in regulating and examining Ohio's banks at yesterday's first hearing.

Neither Banks Supt. Clarence C. Luft nor any of his employees appeared as requested.

State Representative William L. Elliott, Democrat, of Malta, the committee's vice chairman, said "It is extremely relevant that we have someone here from the banking department."

State Senator Anthony O. Calabrese, Democrat, of Cleveland, said the committee could not go ahead until the superintendent of banks appeared to discuss problems in the banking industry.

Meantime, the legislative service commission has been asked to gather information it can in two areas:

Adequacy of the State division of banks to conduct regular examinations of banks as required by law.

Advisability of changing the method by which the superintendent of banks is selected.

Dave Johnson, acting head of the legislative service commission, told the committee that present Ohio law makes no reference to experience requirements of the superintendent. He is appointed by the Governor.

He suggested a look into the method of selecting the superintendent and scrutiny of the bank examination requirements and whether they are being met as part of a six-point study of the banking industry and laws.

Other points on the Johnson recommendation, which the committee temporarily accepted, were:

Legality and propriety of any bank voting its own shares of stock.

Adverse effects of interlocking directorates and holding of stocks.

Appropriateness of standards used in granting charters and branch bank permits.

Enlarging the powers of the banking advisory board.

State Senator Charles W. Whalen, Jr., Republican, of Dayton, chairman, asked the legislative research commission to obtain a transcript of all testimony concerning Ohio banking which has been given before the House Banking Committee, headed by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas.

The executive manager of the Ohio Bankers Association, O. E. Anderson, said his organization welcomes the study.

"We have complete confidence in your ability in not allowing this to become a witch hunt," Anderson said.

He said the association is sure the committee would "approach it [the study] on an industry basis and not be swayed by extraneous matters and personalities."

Although the committee is primarily concerned with State banks, it will compare regulations affecting national banks with State laws.

There are 548 banks in Ohio, of which 332 are State banks.

"The largest bank in Ohio is a State bank—the Cleveland Trust Co.," Anderson said. "The second largest is a national bank, the National City Bank of Cleveland."

[From the Cleveland Press, Feb. 18, 1966]

UNJUSTIFIED ABSENTEEISM

The leisurely probe of State-chartered banks by the legislature's bank investigating committee got off to a sorry start. Neither State Banks Superintendent Clarence Luft nor any of his employees appeared as requested.

This uncooperative attitude gives added weight to those speculations that the probe will accomplish little. So does the date of the next public meeting, March 14.

This investigation is important. Ohioans should know how much financial power is concentrated in State-chartered banks. Luft and his staff insult the legislature and the public by their uncooperative attitude. Governor Rhodes should be sure his employees are present when the committee resumes March 14.

FREE AIRMAIL SHIPMENT TO SERVICEMEN IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to provide free airmail shipment of parcels to our servicemen in Vietnam.

I have had the privilege of visiting our fighting men in Vietnam, and I can attest to the fact that there is nothing like a gift from home, to boost the morale of our GI's at mail call. Whether it be knitted socks from a GI's girlfriend, a box of cookies from mother or an interesting book from father, it makes a GI feel more remembered.

I firmly believe that this is the least we can do. The sending of gifts on a large scale will reflect to our fighting men, a gratified public; and the free use of the mail will reflect a grateful government. Campaigns urging the public to send books and other gifts of interest have been gaining considerable support, but they would be given a real impetus if we allowed these modest mailing privileges.

The bill would, among other things, allow for the free airmail shipment of parcels weighing up to 10 pounds to our servicemen in Vietnam. In addition, the

language is broad enough to cover any similar future situations in which U.S. forces are engaged in hostilities with any foreign force.

I believe that those who donate, collect and wrap these gifts, and carry them to their local post offices perform a truly laudable service, and the least the Federal Government can do is absorb the three or four dollars it costs to ship one of these gifts.

I invite my colleagues to join in sponsoring this legislation, and I urge the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to accord full consideration to this measure.

FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to include lists.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time during this past year, I have endeavored to keep my colleagues of the House informed about the serious problem of free world shipping to North Vietnam. Just recently I received the report on this shipping for the month of February and take this occasion to make this information available to the Members of the House.

The unclassified information for the month of January shows that seven free world ships called at North Vietnamese ports during that month as follows:

NAME OF SHIP, FLAG, GROSS TONNAGE, AND DATE ARRIVED

Agenor, Greece, 7,139 gross tons, January 25.
Amon, Cyprus, 7,229 gross tons, January 28.
Hellas, Greece, 7,176 gross tons, January 19.
Kanaris, Greece, 7,240 gross tons, January 19.

Milford, United Kingdom, 1,889 gross tons, January 4.

Shienfohn, United Kingdom, 7,127 gross tons, January 9.

Shirley Christine, United Kingdom, 6,724 gross tons, January 31.

During the month of February, there were six such arrivals, all of United Kingdom registry, as follows:

NAME OF SHIP, FLAG, GROSS TONNAGE, AND DATE ARRIVED

Ardara, United Kingdom, 5,975 gross tons, February 15.

Greenford, United Kingdom, 2,961 gross tons, February 19.

Milford, United Kingdom, 1,889 gross tons, February —.

Shienfohn, United Kingdom, 7,127 gross tons, February 2.

Shienfohn, United Kingdom, 7,127 gross tons, February —.

Wakasa Bay, United Kingdom, 7,040 gross tons, February 7.

While the volume of this trade has decreased substantially from what it was during the first 2 months of 1965, I hasten to point out that the secret reports show more than twice the number of vessels just mentioned.

While it is regrettable that this traffic was permitted to flourish for so long, the administration officials responsible for finally acting to bring about a reduction of this trading with the enemy are cer-

State Senator Charles Whalen, Jr., of Dayton, chairman of the Ohio Bank Study Committee, told the Journal:

"We start today . . . and we must have an outline of what we are going to investigate and study."

Asked whether the committee will explore the Cleveland Trust situation, Whalen said: "Yes, we will bring up the Cleveland Trust situation and the adequacy of the present law, especially in light of Federal laws dealing with concentrations of power . . . and about banks voting their own stocks, and anything else."

Under a headline, "Predict Whitewash of Banks That Vote Their Own Stock," the Cleveland Press said yesterday:

"And the political betting in Columbus is the committee will come up with little, if anything, to comply with the original intent of the legislative resolution."

A large stockholder in the Cleveland Trust—but unfriendly to its management—told the Journal that the bank was hoping to be able to vote its stock at the March 23 meeting and then try for a change in the Ohio law during the next session of the legislature.

Chairman George Gund of Cleveland Trust was not available for comment since yesterday morning.

CARL STOKES AND SENATOR OCASEK DEMAND ACTION: CLEVELAND TRUST UNDER FIRE AT HEARING ON OHIO BANKS

(By John Safell)

COLUMBUS.—The Cleveland Trust Co., biggest bank in the State, has become a storm center at legislative hearings that could lead to changing Ohio's banking laws.

Several legislators are calling for a close look into what they describe as a Cleveland Trust practice of voting its own stock and some it holds in trust.

Representative Carl Stokes, who just narrowly lost the race for mayor of Cleveland to Ralph Locher, sent this telegram to State Senator Charles W. Whalen, Jr., chairman of the bank study committee.

"The Lorain Journal has published this week a series of articles highly critical of the policies and practices of the Cleveland Trust Co., the largest financial institution in Ohio. I urge you to bring these articles to the attention of all members of your committee at the beginning of your investigation of Ohio banks."

State Representative Stokes added:

"I was deeply disturbed to read in the Cleveland Press a story which predicts that your committee will whitewash the banks in their practice of voting their own stocks and in other acts that many consider to be illegal and improper. The common man has a deep interest in the ethical standards of our financial institutions and I am confident that your committee will do a good job in the important study which the senate and the house have instructed you to undertake."

State Senator Oliver Ocasek, of Northfield, was responsible for the resolution which started the probe in Columbus. He kept off the study committee.

Senator Ocasek, nevertheless, also sent a telegram to the committee, saying:

"The Cleveland Trust Co. stockholders meeting to elect directors, for a year occurs next month. It is reported that the bank again intends to vote some 85 percent of its own stock for a board of directors selected by its chairman. In my opinion, the laws of Ohio forbid an Ohio bank to vote stock issued by it."

The senator also said:

"The public interest demands that your committee investigate and report prior to their impending annual meeting on the legality and ethics of insiders in banks perpetuating themselves in office by voting

of stock held in trust for widows and orphans. I would welcome an opportunity to discuss this with your committee."

The initial 2½-hour session of the 15 member committee proved somewhat of a "feeling out" period in which the scope of the study was discussed.

The committee agreed to take up three of the less controversial areas first:

Adequacy of the State division of banks to conduct regular examinations.

Standards and methods used in granting charter and branch permits.

Advisability of changing the method of selecting the superintendent of banks. (Now, he is appointed by Governor.)

The three hot items on the agenda will be taken up last, later this year, and possibly not in time for the next session of the legislature in January. They are:

The legality and propriety of any bank voting its own shares of stock.

The possible adverse affect upon competition and other public interests of interlocking holding of stocks among various banks of the State.

The possible need for enlarging the powers and responsibilities of the State banking advisory board.

CLEVELAND TRUST PLAYED FOR SECRETIVE TRUST OPERATION

The Cleveland Trust Co. came under new criticism today for operating a trust "secretly" and "restrictively."

While the bank was under attack, State Banks Superintendent Clarence Luft was criticized for not cooperating with the State bank study committee, which is taking a hard look at the Cleveland Trust and other financial institutions in the State.

Cleveland Trust holds the purse strings for Kingwood Center, a flower garden and beauty spot which the late C. K. King left in trust for the benefit of the people of Mansfield and Ohio.

In an editorial, the News Journal of Mansfield said:

"As corporate trustee, the Cleveland bank has never revealed publicly the amount of the trust, nor has it revealed the amount of annual earnings from which Mr. King designated that Kingwood Center be operated and maintained."

"The public has no way of knowing whether the trust is being capably and wisely managed. It appears to be the attitude of Cleveland Trust that this is none of the public's business even though Mr. King clearly intended that the center be operated for the benefit of the people of Mansfield and Ohio."

"Recently when it was sought to determine if a theater could be built, as Mr. King suggested for part of the center's development, the answer came back from Cleveland Trust: 'No chance for at least 5 years. Planning requires knowledge of funds on hand and reasonably anticipated. When the knowledge is withheld, so is the opportunity to outline future progress."

"Inasmuch as C. K. King began planning for the establishment of Kingwood Center for many years before his death, it appears unlikely that he ever envisioned such restrictions upon scheduling of future growth and development as now exist."

"Legally and technically, the Cleveland Trust may be entirely correct. As a matter of public relations it is dead wrong."

State Banks Superintendent Luft was chastised by the Cleveland Press and Governor Rhodes urged to make sure his employees cooperate with the legislature. The editorial said:

"The leisurely probe of State-chartered banks by the legislature's bank investigating committee got off to a sorry start. Neither State Banks Superintendent Clarence Luft nor any of his employees appeared as requested."

"This uncooperative attitude gives added weight to those speculations that the probe will accomplish little. So does the date of the next public meeting, March 14."

"This investigation is important. Ohioans should know how much financial power is concentrated in State-chartered banks. Luft and his staff insult the legislature and the public by their uncooperative attitude. Governor Rhodes should be sure his employees are present when the committee resumes March 14."

CLEVELAND TRUST RESOURCES TOP \$2 BILLION; OHIO FIRST—EARNINGS GREATEST OF NATION'S BANKS

The Cleveland Trust Co., which is under fire for its immense concentration of economic power, today reported that it had become the first bank in Ohio to achieve \$2 billion in total resources.

The annual report also showed that 1965 was the year in which net operating earnings increased 19.8 percent—the greatest improvement reported by any of America's top 25 banks.

Two Ohio legislators—State Senator Oliver Ocasek and State Representative Carl Stokes—want the new Ohio Bank Study Committee to challenge the property and ethics of the Cleveland Trust voting its own stock and dominating major corporations and banks. The next meeting of the legislative bank committee is March 14 at Columbus.

In the Cleveland Trust's notice to stockholders of the annual meeting March 23, 1966, at 1:30 p.m., at 916 Euclid Avenue, Chairman George Gund and President George Karch pointed out that its dummy partnership, A. A. Welsh & Co., holds 502,329 shares (33.48 percent) of the outstanding stock of the bank.

Stewart Anthony, secretary of the bank, explained that A. A. Welsh & Co. is a partnership organized by the bank for the sole purpose of acting as "nominee" to take and hold record title to registered securities held by the bank in various trust capacities.

The bank officers vote this stock, along with another 25,278 shares held by the bank in other capacities, including F. J. Haffner & Co. and Custo & Co.

Much of the criticism leveled by legislators and others boils down to the charge that the bank officers vote the stock to perpetuate themselves in office and to dominate and control other corporations.

Here's how the voting of 527,600 shares are held in the bank's trust capacity:

One: 12,994 shares were registered in the names of principals of agency or custodian accounts and the bank as fiduciary has no power to vote the shares.

Two: 61,309 shares were held in agency or custodian accounts where the direction of the principal is required before voting.

Three: 3,931 shares were held in trusts where the direction of the donor, cotrustee, or other person is required before voting.

Four: 51,607 shares were held in trusts or estates where the approval of the donor, co-fiduciary, or other designated person or persons is required before voting.

Five: 152,351 shares were held in trusts or agency where the bank as fiduciary may determine the manner of voting only in the absence of instructions from one or more designated persons.

Six: \$245,368 shares (16.36 percent of the total shares outstanding) were held in trusts, estates, or agency where the bank as fiduciary has sole voting power.

The bank management solicited proxies from stockholders to vote for new directors. The Cleveland Trust appointed to handle and vote the proxies the following of its own directors:

Herman L. Vall, president of the Cleveland Plain Dealer; George Gund, chairman of the

tainly to be commended for their efforts. That this trade has been reduced clearly shows that effective measures can be taken to discourage our friends from such shipping activities.

In recent weeks there have been reports that Norwegian shipowners have privately agreed to stop plying the North Vietnamese trading lanes. In addition, King Constantine of Greece signed a decree effective as of March 10 forbidding the use of Greek-flag vessels in carrying cargoes to or from North Vietnamese ports, except for those already under charter before the decree was effective. These actions are most encouraging.

Nevertheless, the attitude of our own Government remains decidedly less than fully satisfactory. The gap in our official efforts has invited, and perhaps required, the independent initiative of non-Government organizations to bring full pressure to bear to dry up this trade such as the threatened boycott proposed by the Maritime Unions of the east and gulf coast ports. As I join those who commend the Maritime Unions for their concern I must at the same time express disappointment with the administration's abdication of the conduct of foreign policy in this field.

Now, however, is not the time to relax our efforts. Our momentum must not be lost. It must be accelerated to eliminate entirely the possibility of even one free world ship going to North Vietnam. To accomplish this there must be fuller information provided to the American people and to the world about this trade. If free world ships are helping to supply the enemy, why should our people be told half the truth—why not the whole truth?

A good measure of the success achieved in curbing this trade has been due to an aroused and informed public opinion both within and without the Congress. If we are to keep faith with the hundreds of thousands of boys we have sent to Vietnam, we must not fail in giving them our full support. I call upon the administration to be more forthright in reporting the true extent of this aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Again I commend the gentleman from Michigan for bringing this information to the Members of the House. I ask the gentleman if it is not also important that pressures be applied to these various countries, including Britain, which are shipping to Red China? By this devious route they can still provide the sinews of war to North Vietnam.

This involves not alone the question of shipping to Haiphong, but also the question of shipping to Red China.

Why should there, also, shipping to Communist Cuba, which has become the spawning ground and the training ground for subversion in the Western Hemisphere?

It seems to me that the State Department and the officials of this Govern-

ment ought to be applying pressure not only with respect to North Vietnam but also with respect to trade with Red China and with Communist Cuba.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I share those views completely.

The administration certainly should be looking at these areas.

I have called attention to North Vietnam because this is such a flagrant case. Hundreds of thousands of our boys are there tonight, in combat with the enemy, while our friends are carrying material to keep the war going. This should not be tolerated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. BOLAND'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CHICAGO TRIBUNE'S SPECTACULAR REPORT ON CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. PUCINSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.]

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune has begun a spectacular series on the history, growth, and the present magnitude of Chicago as a world center of commerce, industry, science, religion, education, sports, and culture.

I am taking the liberty of putting this series in the Record as it unfolds because I would like to share with my colleagues and the distinguished readers who follow the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the real story of how Chicago—once called the crime capital of the world—today stands as a model city of the world.

The Chicago Tribune deserves the highest commendation for its fair and impartial writing of one of the great stories of our time—the renaissance of America's second largest city.

Mr. Dave Halvorsen has magnificently captured the spirit of Chicago, 1966.

I hope those around the world who are so quick to criticize this thriving metropolis known as Chicago will read Mr. Halvorsen's penetrating series.

Recently I said that the second half of the 20th century belongs to Chicago. This dynamic series in the Chicago Tribune fortifies my contention; and it gives a new spirit of pride and dedication to 3½ million people who live in Chicago.

The Chicago Tribune is performing a most significant public service in bringing to all Americans—through its influential and widespread national circulation—the real story of Chicago as it exists today.

The first articles of the Chicago Tribune series follow. It is my plan to include the rest of the articles as this impressive series unfolds;

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 5, 1966]

CHICAGO SHAKES OFF OLD LABEL OF SECOND CITY—"PRAIRIE TOWN" ADDING NEW FRONTIERS (By David Halvorsen)

(NOTE.—Chicago has come alive in the last 10 years and is experiencing the greatest prosperity in its history. Its citizens see its municipal development not as problems but as challenges. The Tribune begins today a comprehensive and exhaustive series of articles analyzing Metropolitan Chicago's resurgence and what it will mean in years to come.)

Chicago forged a giant structure of prosperity in the last decade to place the city at the threshold of the greatest era in its history.

The midwestern metropolis is fulfilling the dreams of those who believe in it.

Once called a prairie town because it was one, and later called a prairie town in spite, because it was not one, the city has come alive and is one of the most vibrant, progressive cities in the world.

Thomas H. Coulter, chief executive director of the Chicago Association of Commerce, has called it "the most enlightened city in the world today."

HAS YET TO HIT PEAK

The city has yet to reach the peak of its current resurgence, and chances are it will not for a long time, asserts Mayor Daley.

Chicago is not advancing in the wake of a prosperous economy; it is leading the surge. It has shaken off the inferiority complex of the crime-ridden prohibition era and the era's legacy of civic doldrums which set in after the depression and lasted for nearly 25 years.

"For years we believed what everyone said about us," said a city hall official. "We kept comparing Chicago with perfection. Now we have changed. We are comparing it with other great cities, and we are coming out first."

"Perfection is the ultimate goal. We are closer to it than anyone else."

Civic leaders are calling this the "sensational sixties," outstripping even the great rebuilding era following the Chicago fire of 1871 which burned out 2,124 acres of the central city and caused property damage of \$200 million.

PRODUCT IS HUGE

Metropolitan Chicago's share of the gross national product, the sum of all services and manufactured goods, is \$34.4. This is six times more than the national output of Austria and greater than that of all the Scandinavian countries combined.

The area's industrial development is twice that of its nearest competitor—and that includes New York City. More than 4,000 new factories have been constructed here in the last 20 years, most in the last decade.

"At one time the industrial center of the United States was just west of New York City," Coulter pointed out. "Now it is in Chicago and will be for a long time to come."

Studies by Coulter's association show the average family income of metropolitan Chicago to be \$11,400. This is 30 percent more than the national average and \$1,000 more than New York City.

The association places the Indiana counties of Lake and Porter and the Illinois counties of Cook, Lake, McHenry, Du Page, Kane, and Will in the metropolitan area.

LOOP IS FOCAL POINT

The drama of the city's prosperity is performed in the central business district with the Loop as a stage for all the world to see.

Here are giant buildings, some with revolutionary forms of architecture.

The erection of the Prudential Building in 1955 was the breakthrough. It was the first

major structure built on the Loop since the Field Building in 1932.

New York City experienced an extraordinary post-World War II construction boom while little was happening in Chicago. Now, New York is beset with major municipal problems while Chicago and its suburbs leap ahead.

Daley, a Democrat, first was elected in 1955. Chicago's revival closely parallels the emergence of his leadership.

Businessmen, industrialists, labor and civic leaders all give their respective professions much of the credit for this new vitality, but they point to Daley as the person who brought all the forces together.

BRINGS ABOUT RAPPORT

"The mayor has brought about an amalgamation of the best of labor, politics, religion, education, and business," said Edward Logelin, vice president of the United States Steel Corp. and chairman of the Chicago plan commission. Logelin is a Republican.

"When he gets us around the conference table, it is not to talk about differences but the common interests of Chicago."

In pinpointing the reasons for Chicago's resurgence, 1959 is a vintage year.

After 7 years of discussions, work commenced on O'Hare International Airport. The St. Lawrence Seaway opened, making Chicago an international port. Chicago was host to the Pan-American games. The city's first international trade fair took place and the Queen of England came to visit.

Her reception was quite different from that of the first royalty to visit the city.

PRINCE WAS INVITED

That was in 1860, when Long John Wentworth, the mayor, invited Albert Edward, Prince of Wales and later to become Edward VII, to visit Chicago.

The prince accepted on the condition he could come incognito as Baron Renfrew. There was to be no fanfare.

Edward underestimated Chicago's resourcefulness. When he started to tour the city, shiny fire engines fell in behind his carriage. Then came numerous floats representing the city's industries, and 50,000 persons lined his route along Wabash and Michigan Avenues.

This sort of spirit always has been a characteristic of Chicago.

It is with this same energy that Chicago is beating the drums for new business. The city's emissaries have been well received in New York City and other cities by businessmen anxious to learn of the advantages offered here.

COMPUTER TELLS STORY

When Chrysler Corp. decided to build a new plant, it collected basic information from probable sites throughout the country. This data was put on 1,600 tabulating cards and fed to a computer. The answer came up Belvidere, east of Rockford, and only 75 miles northwest of Chicago.

A key reason was Chicago's vast transportation network. It is the center of the world's air, rail, and truck systems and is rapidly developing as a seaport.

Businesses are finding that the prestige address of New York City may be costing them thousands of dollars in extra operating costs.

An accountant association in New York City made a survey of operation costs in Chicago. The association found it could save \$70,000 annually in air fares alone by locating here.

A confectionery company discovered it's more economical to import cocoa beans, needed for chocolate, through Chicago and market the finished product from here than to import the beans through east and west coast ports. The company closed down its coast operations.

FOUNDED AS TRADING POST

Chicago is only 129 years old. It was founded as a frontier trading post. It is now the greatest trading center in the world.

Its image has been given a big boost because of the misfortunes that have befallen New York City.

New York has a per capita bonded debt of \$446.07. Chicago's is \$145.90. Furthermore, Chicago's bonded debt is of short duration and represents 42 percent of the city's constitutional limit of indebtedness.

New York's heralded World's Fair fell short of expectations. The city has experienced crippling newspaper strikes and the recent transit strike. It was the victim of a power surge which blacked out the New England States.

The east coast metropolis faces another severe water shortage this summer unless New England gets above-normal snowfall the rest of this winter.

Crime publicity, which had made Chicago a favorite whipping boy for three generations, has tapped a lucrative source in recent years in New York City.

Chicago has not had a newspaper strike in 17 years. It last had a mass transit strike in 1922. Commonwealth Edison has said that the massive blackout which hit New England is unlikely here.

WATER SUPPLY IS EXCELLENT

The water supply in Chicago is excellent. A city resident can get unlimited water for approximately \$30 a year. This includes garbage pickup. Chicago provides water to 61 suburbs. The city put into operation a year ago the world's largest and most modern water filtration plant.

Jarred by the Summerdale police scandal in 1961, Chicago reacted positively to reform. Police Superintendent O. W. Wilson streamlined the police communications system, increased the number of squads on the street, boosted the prestige of the policeman, and instituted Operation Crimestop, a program encouraging citizens to report crimes and suspicious activities.

Last year, crime on Chicago streets declined 12 percent although every other metropolitan city and the Nation as a whole reported substantial increases. Chicago's police administration has become a prototype for other municipalities, both foreign and national.

The summer before the great fire of 1871, Chicagoans were paying more in fire insurance rates than they were contributing in municipal, county, and State taxes combined.

By contrast, Chicago today has a class II rating from the National Board of Underwriters for fire insurance. What makes this remarkable is that no city has a class I rating and only 11 cities have class II. Chicago is the only city of more than 1 million population among the 11.

HAS LOW DEATH RATE

The city had the lowest metropolitan traffic death rate in 1960, 1962, and 1964, and earned the honor again in 1965. Chicago has received the cleanest city award in 5 of the last 6 years.

The resurgence reaches far beyond the boundaries of the city or the 7.5 million persons living in the eight-county metropolitan area. Chicago's influence on the entire Midwest is probably greater than is actually realized, civic leaders point out.

For example, a truck pulling out of a Chicago terminal tonight with a cargo of manufactured goods will be unloading at a warehouse in Charles City, Iowa, 360 miles distant, tomorrow morning.

Many producers have found it more economical to export overseas from the port of Chicago than through the coastal cities of New Orleans and Baltimore.

A canning factory in Madison, Tenn., which exports canned corn to northwestern Europe, has found it cheaper to ship through Chicago than New Orleans.

GET FAVORABLE RATES

Minnesota, Nebraska, and Kansas producers are discovering more favorable shipping rates through the Chicago port.

Businessmen are continually revising the boundaries of the Chicago trade area. Now they think in terms of a 500-mile radius which includes a population of 63 million.

The revitalization of the railroads, the completion of the Interstate Highway Systems and city expressways, and the expansion of the seaport make all of this realistic. Historians have called Chicago the most American of all cities. Some have been critical of the premium put on the dollar by Chicagoans.

MANY BECOME WEALTHY

The society of other great cities was based on heritage. Chicago's society was determined by bank accounts. Great personal fortunes have been made here, and in many different ways.

The Palmers, Armours, Fields and others became some of the world's wealthiest families.

In assessing the drive behind Chicago's current prosperity, history may offer a lesson. At the very beginning, Chicago's wealthy leaders found private gain and public interest were compatible.

A healthy city meant a prosperous business. The formula is still working today.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 6, 1966]

CHICAGO GROWTH TO GREATNESS IS ONLY BEGINNING

(By David Halvorsen)

The wagon trains trundled regularly into the dirt streets of Chicago in the 1830's. They set up temporary camp south of Fort Dearborn along what is now Michigan Avenue.

Most were fortune seekers heading westward, but some assessed, quite accurately, that the frontier town had a future and therefore was a place to make a lot of money and make it fast.

Indian trails had led to the confluence of the Chicago and Des Plaines Rivers, and for much the same reason the pioneers followed these routes. It was a logical way to get across the country.

GEOGRAPHY TRUMP CARD

Soon followed the steam locomotive. Chicago became the terminal between the Eastern and Western railroads. Later came the highways bearing motorcars, the waterways to the Mississippi River and the sea, and the airlines.

Geography has been Chicago's trump card since the city went after the high stakes of becoming one of the world's great urban centers.

In the last decade the city has been dealt a handful of aces.

1. Metropolitan Chicago is the industrial center of the world. The area, with 3.8 percent of the national population, produces 5.1 percent of the gross national product.

NEAR POPULATION CENTER

2. The population center of the United States is on a 160-acre farm, 6.5 miles northwest of Centuria and about 1 mile south-southwest of the community of Shattuc in Clinton County.

3. Illinois is the leading agricultural producing State in the union.

4. Chicago is the center of the world's greatest transportation network.

March 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

5621

FOUR PREVIOUS POINTS

The North Vietnamese National Assembly on April 10, 1965, had posed these four points as conditions for negotiations:

1. All U.S. troops must withdraw from South Vietnam. (It was not stipulated that withdrawal would have to take place before a negotiated settlement rather than after, so this point was apparently left open for bargaining.)

2. Pending peaceful reunification of Vietnam, the 1954 military agreement must be respected and both North and South remain neutral.

3. Internal affairs must be settled by South Vietnamese themselves, "in accordance with the program of the National Liberation Front," without any foreign interference.

4. Peaceful reunification of Vietnam to be settled by Vietnamese people in both zones without foreign interference.

These conditions are subject to long and tortured interpretation, but they are not a complete bar to discussions. They are not irreconcilable with the 14 points set forth by President Johnson on January 3, 1966.

The President's offer of negotiation terms, however, quickly drew the new and impossible fifth point from Ho Chi Minh. He knows of course that we could not refuse a place at the conference table to the government we have supported in Saigon. To do so would be to surrender the people we have made our allies to the Communists, fully and finally. It would be to seal the fate of South Vietnam without an expression of the will of the people.

It is a familiar technique in a dispute for one side to offer to talk, but set conditions it knows its opponent cannot conceivably accept. The Soviet Union has played that game in the long struggle for disarmament. Now Hanoi makes negotiation unattainable, while loudly accusing America of bad faith in its efforts toward peace.

The intransigence of Hanoi does not mean that America should abandon all efforts to negotiate. If anything, it increases our duty to maintain and strengthen our peaceful intentions.

But in the meanwhile there is no use blinding ourselves to what is happening in Hanoi and Peking. The Communist leaders believe they are going to win, and they will at present accept no compromise short of total victory.

SUPPORT OF POLICY

(Mr. KING of Utah (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Salt Lake Tribune states editorially that in voting additional funds to conduct the war in Vietnam "Congress acted responsibly—and in accordance with the views of most Americans."

The paper believes that most Americans do not want an "unrestrained escalation," but that they do want an honorable peace and that they are ready for "unconditional negotiations toward that end anywhere, under any auspices."

Because the summation made by this newspaper will be of interest to many, I am making the editorial available by offering it now for publication in the Record:

CONGRESS VOTES SUPPORT OF VIET POLICY

There seems little doubt that the overwhelming approval in Congress of additional funds to finance the war in Vietnam is a victory for the administration in the current debate over its Vietnam policy.

The House voted approval of the additional \$4.8 billion by 392 to 4, the Senate by 93 to 2.

Approval of the money was inevitable, for Congress could hardly vote in effect to abandon the more than 200,000 American troops now engaged with the Communists on the ground in South Vietnam.

But the vote might not have been so overwhelming, and it need not have been preceded by such a smashing Senate defeat of Senator WAYNE MORSE's effort to repudiate the 1964 resolution pledging congressional support for "all necessary measures" to resist Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

On a motion to table (kill) Senator MORSE's motion, only 4 Senators joined MORSE, with 92 in effect voting to reconfirm the resolution.

NO ESCALATION MANDATE

A minority of House and Senate liberals—put at 77 in the House and 17 in the Senate—deny the vote for more Vietnam funds was a mandate for unrestrained escalation of the war.

Of course it wasn't. And only a small minority of Americans advocate such escalation, just as only a small minority advocate American retreat.

Even Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who voted with MORSE on the 1964 resolution repudiation, did not advocate withdrawal in explaining his vote. He rather simply pointed to the need for seeking a "general accommodation" in southeast Asia for "neutralization of the entire region as between China and the United States."

But as Peter Lisagor, of the Chicago Daily News Service, points out, administration spokesmen have supported a neutral Laos and Cambodia, and have agreed to a non-aligned South Vietnam if the Communists will call off their aggression. It is Communist China, not the United States, which has consistently rejected neutralization.

Despite the continued negative attitude of both Communist China and North Vietnam, President Johnson again extended the olive branch. While the Senate was debating the increased aid bill, he called again on Hanoi to "negotiate peace" and renewed his offer for a "massive effort of reconstruction" after a settlement in both North and South Vietnam.

UNDER CAREFUL CONTROL

While this was balanced by a promise to continue the "measured use of force," the White House said the President would "continue to act responsibly" and it reiterated his New York pledge to use "prudent firmness under careful control."

It seems to us that this is all anyone can ask, and that Congress acted responsibly—and in accordance with the views of most Americans. They desire, no more than the President, unrestrained escalation of this war. They want a peace settlement which will permit the orderly and honorable withdrawal of American troops. They are ready for unconditional negotiations toward that end anywhere, under any auspices.

It is not new American policy to support people resisting Communist aggression, nor to uphold the basic principle of self-determination of people. American policy in Vietnam is simply a continuance of a firm U.S. stand against Communist aggression which this country has followed for nearly 20 years at a dozen points along the vast periphery of the Russian and Chinese Communist empires. And we believe that fundamental policy has the same basic American support today that it had when it first took form under President Truman.

TOO MANY COOKS

(Mr. KING of Utah (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) was granted permission

to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star editorially praises the President's recommendations made in his message on pollution and conservation.

His recommendations included transfer of the Water Pollution Control Administration from the Public Health Service to the Interior Department, and establishing a National Water Commission "to review and advise on the entire range of water resources problems."

The Star concludes that:

Perhaps the great conservation task that so badly needs doing is at last about to shift into high gear.

The timely appraisal will interest my colleagues, and I therefore make the editorial a part of the Record:

TOO MANY COOKS

Two things emerge from President Johnson's message on pollution and conservation that may have more long-range significance than the specific requests he has made. These are his recommendations to transfer the Water Pollution Control Administration from the Public Health Service to the Interior Department, which controls most water programs, and to establish a National Water Commission "to review and advise on the entire range of water resources problems."

At the moment there are far too many cooks at the Federal level involved in the field of conservation. For example, in our own Potomac Basin a White House-backed than the specific requests he has made, for the Nation is confronted with coordinating antipollution planning among four agencies. The President's recommendation would at least narrow this to three.

What is really needed, of course, is a much greater concentration than this. The Hoover Commission recommended that total conservation responsibility be concentrated in a Department of Natural Resources. And a bill sponsored by Senator MOSS, of Utah, aimed at this desirable goal even now is before Congress.

The political complexities in any such reorganization are great and there can be no quick and easy solution. But the proposals to transfer antipollution responsibility and coordinate water resource planning look like steps in the right direction. Perhaps the great conservation task that so badly needs doing is at last about to shift into high gear.

VIETNAM

(Mr. KING of Utah (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the congressional dialog on Vietnam continues apace, and few there are, by now, who have not spoken out. My own position is that we must continue to resist Communist aggression and terrorism. I have affirmed, and reaffirmed this proposition on occasions too numerous to mention.

I willingly concede that we have made mistakes. If it were possible to unravel the tangled fabric of the past, no doubt a better fabric could then be rewoven. But that is not our present option. It was Adlai Stevenson, I believe, who said:

5622

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

March 15, 1966

"If the present persists in setting in judgment on the past, the future is lost."

The time is now for action. The signals have already been called, and the ball is in motion. America has no other choice than to execute the play, and to smash forward to a touchdown. This does not mean that our policy or methods are no longer open to discussion, or even to criticism. Far from it. On several occasions I myself have raised my voice against sloppy and inefficient practices which I felt were militating against our success in the field. I shall continue to do so.

It is one thing, however, to offer constructive criticism, in order to improve the war effort. It is another thing to embarrass, or obstruct, or to deliberately weaken our national will to fight. With any such effort I have no sympathy.

There has been so much said about what we are doing wrong, and so little, comparatively speaking, about what we are doing right. It is with a view to strengthening our will, and putting our present posture into a truer perspective that I am taking this time to review, briefly, the splendid work of our JUSPAO organization, and the success it has had in the field of psychological warfare. We hear so much about the conventional battles that are raging in Vietnam, and about the statistics on casualties suffered, lives lost, and planes and materiel destroyed. The real war however, is being fought, not for the bodies but for the minds of the Vietcong. The work of JUSPAO is no less significant because it receives so little recognition. In my opinion it is our ultimate weapon.

SELECTIVE ACHIEVEMENTS OF JUSPAO GENERAL

Just as crucial as, and in the long run more important than, the current military effort in Vietnam is the struggle for the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese. At the heart of this psychological task is communication—particularly communication between the populace and their government. In the U.S. mission, the agency with primary responsibility for counseling and assisting the Government of Vietnam—GVN—in the field of psychological action is the Joint United States Public Affairs Office—JUSPAO.

JUSPAO was created in May 1965 as a result of President Johnson's decision giving the Director of USIA authority over all U.S. psychological operations in Vietnam. The majority of the American staff are USIA officers, but others come from the Department of State, AID, and the U.S. military. Headed by a senior USIA official—who is also Minister Counselor of Embassy for Information—JUSPAO is a U.S. mission organization which provides unified direction for all U.S. psychological action in Vietnam. Having directly integrated the communication media functions of USAID Vietnam, JUSPAO is the U.S. civilian channel for providing communication equipment and technical advice to the GVN. Through policy direction given to the psywar operations of MACV's Political Warfare Directorate, JUSPAO helps assure close coordination between U.S. civilian and military psywar personnel in provincial operations.

JUSPAO has three main psychological objectives: First, to strengthen the Vietnamese will to support GVN/US mutual objectives; second, to strengthen the government's communication media and programs to increase popular support of its overall objectives; and third, to strengthen free world support for Vietnam and of Vietnamese support for U.S. worldwide policy objectives.

In pursuit of these objectives, JUSPAO has over 150 American officers and nearly 400 Vietnamese employees. Ideas, personal contact, media materials, and communication equipment are tools and channels in this war for men's minds. The impact of various JUSPAO programs very often is localized. The successes may not lend themselves to newspaper headlines. They are the backside of news, and some of these are capsulized below.

RADIO

In a country like South Vietnam where literacy rate is low, particularly in the rural area, radio is a vital link between the Government and the people. In the past, the Radio Vietnam—VTVN—with a station in Saigon and several regional transmitters was not fully utilized or coordinated because of poor organization, lack of trained personnel and programming skills. As a first step toward helping the GVN develop a more truly national radio network, JUSPAO convinced and assisted the GVN in December 1965 to restructure Radio Vietnam into a semi-autonomous broadcasting corporation. Steps are now being taken to link the existing stations into a national network. Two JUSPAO radio advisory teams are actively engaged in training Vietnamese in program production, station and network management and administration, and central and regional programming. One of the teams is assigned to the VTVN while the other is assisting the Vietnamese Defense Ministry's Voice of Freedom Station which broadcasts to North Vietnam.

JUSPAO also produces locally between 60 and 75 hours of radio programs every week for placement with Vietnamese stations. From Washington, the Voice of America broadcasts to South and North Vietnam 6½ hours daily in Vietnamese. The Voice maintains a transmitting and relay complex in Hue, South Vietnam, just south of the 17th parallel. The 50,000 watt, medium-wave relay transmitter has directional antennas capable of providing strong signals to both North and South Vietnam. Over the past year and a half, incidentally, the site has been shelled by the Vietcong several times.

OTHER MEDIA

JUSPAO effort is not confined to radio. A publication adviser is working with the Vietnamese Ministry of Psywar in the production of pamphlets, leaflets and posters. In the GVN's National Motion Picture Center, a JUSPAO adviser helps in all aspects of the conception and production of newsreels, documentaries and feature films. To help the GVN improve its press output and thus to facilitate coverage of Vietnam developments by foreign newsmen, a JUSPAO press adviser is assigned to the Vietnam Press,

the Government's national news agency, to provide on-the-job training and classroom instructions on journalism.

PSYCHOLOGICAL OPERATIONS IN THE PROVINCES

JUSPAO operates extensively in rural South Vietnam, and some 40 American JUSPAO field representatives are stationed in the provinces to give assistance and support to cadres of the Vietnamese Information Service—VIS—in psychological operations. The tasks of JUSPAO field representatives cover a wide spectrum; namely, stimulating action by provincial psychological operations committees in every province; assisting in the publication of 24 provincial newspapers and programming of regional radio stations; showing GVN and JUSPAO films made for provincial audiences; developing posters, pamphlets, leaflets and other publications designed for audiences in a particular province or even district; employing airborne loudspeakers and leaflet drops for fast exploitation of local issues; and deploying VIS and JUSPAO cultural troupes which present a government message via entertainment.

A considerable part of the JUSPAO effort in the Provinces has gone into supporting the Government's Chieu Hoi—Open Arms—program which encourages Vietcong and their followers to return to government-controlled areas. Where local Chieu Hoi programs are imaginatively and vigorously pursued and where especially effective leaflets and other messages are employed, the psychological tasks of persuasion has yielded results. The following incidents show this by the extent of Vietcong reaction and counteraction.

In August, 1965, 150,000 copies of a JUSPAO-originated leaflet were air-dropped into parts of Vinh Binh Province in the Delta. According to returnees who defected on the basis of it as well as captured Vietcong documents, within 3 days every Vietcong found picking up or holding this leaflet was immediately transferred to another region so that he would not "contaminate" others. Also around this time, in Vinh Long Province nearby, the Vietcong were driven to holding public meetings to counter the Chieu Hoi appeal. The villagers in these public meetings were warned that anyone found with a leaflet was liable to be shot. They were also told that anyone going over to the government side in response to the appeal would be tortured.

That Vietcong threats and intimidation have not been fully effective can be seen in the number of individuals who have responded to the Chieu Hoi appeal since the program was launched in February 1963. From that time to date, some 30,000 Vietcong and their followers had returned to the government side; 11,000 of them came back during 1965 alone. The monthly returnee rate last year is particularly notable for its sharp upward trend. In January 1965, there were 406 returnees; by December the number had climbed to 1,482. In January 1966, the 1,672 Chieu Hoi returnees who came back set an alltime record. These statistics reflect the impact of U.S.

military buildup, upswing of Vietnamese morale and the series of GVN-US military successes. Since JUSPAO psychological operations were aimed at reinforcing and exploiting these favorable trends, the Chieu Hoi statistics are in part a measure of JUSPAO accomplishment.

Statistical profile aside, there have also been instances of specific reaction to the GVN-US psychological operations aimed specifically at the Vietcong.

On October 24, 1965, copies of eight different leaflets were airdropped in a coordinated psywar campaign into Vietcong strongholds in the IV Corps area. In the next week, a check of Vietcong defectors indicated that of the 86 coming in from the areas covered, 62 carried copies of the leaflets dropped on October 24. Reacting to other media used, the Vietcong in one instance moved into a village and removed all anti-Vietcong slogans and banners and warned the people not to take part in any demonstration being organized as part of the psywar campaign. Yet in another village, as a result of demonstrations held, the villagers drew up a letter stressing their determination to resist Vietcong pressure. The letter was signed by 65 villagers—an act of considerable courage since it could easily turn into a Vietcong death warrant.

A complete unit defection, that of a 22-man Vietcong guerrilla platoon occurred in mid-December 1965, in Binh Tuy Province, as a result of a coordinated military-psychological warfare operation. JUSPAO played an active role assisting the Vietnamese in carrying out the psychological phase which included ground and air loudspeaker operations and leaflets. Wives of known Vietcong were permitted and encouraged to cross the frontline positions to contact their husbands and assure them that they would be well treated and that they should surrender. The surrender appeals specified that the Vietcong should come via roads, with their shirts off, hands over their heads and with their rifles slung, muzzles pointed downward. Within a week of the operation, Vietcong defectors began to come in, usually in two's and three's. The 22-man platoon, however, brought with them 9 rifles and, as a group, followed the explicit instructions mentioned above.

JUSPAO SUPPORT TO SOCIAL REFORM

Compared to the immediate impact of psywar efforts, the JUSPAO role in support of social improvement and reform programs in South Vietnam is of a longer range nature. To assist the Government to win and maintain the loyalties of its people, particularly in rural areas, JUSPAO exploits the economic and social progress which the GVN with AID support has been able to achieve in the countryside. There, military security must precede economic and social developmental efforts, but such development is directly related to a favorable psychological climate which JUSPAO activities aim to create. This involves more than publicizing GVN projects carried out with AID assistance; it involves

instilling confidence in the benefits of self-help on the part of the villagers as well as confidence that the Government is sincerely interested in helping the people and in fact is doing so in various fields; and of great importance, in helping the GVN communicate to its people its plans for a social revolution.

Media products on AID activities are produced by JUSPAO for use not only in Vietnam but—through USIS posts—in many third countries as well. A series of photos packets are periodically sent to some 78 USIS posts worldwide for placement in the indigenous press and periodicals; these contain a substantial number of AID stories. Two USIA officers are assigned full time to maintain liaison with USAID in Saigon; they help develop media materials on AID projects and facilitate third-country coverage of these projects. In motion pictures, the JUSPAO biweekly series of news magazines deals with U.S. aid to South Vietnam, among other topics. And between one-third and one-half of the regular radio series—produced by JUSPAO in the field or USIA in Washington—are frequently on AID topics; such as, round-table discussion on economic development programs, documentary coverage of AID projects, interviews with “uncommon people,” among whom are AID technicians and experts.

AID stories and articles on agricultural hints and self-help projects are featured prominently in the JUSPAO mass-circulating magazine, *Rural Spirit*. A monthly magazine written in simple language designed principally for a peasant audience in support of the GVN rural construction program, *Rural Spirit* is distributed in 350,000 copies per issue. The Vietnamese edition of *Free World* magazine also carries the story of economic development and nation building to a more sophisticated audience of school teachers and students. Its monthly circulation is 235,000 copies.

POSTSCRIPT

As James Reston wrote in the *New York Times* of February 18, 1966:

Vietnam is the first American war . . . fought with the television cameras right on the battlefield. The advantages are obvious. These . . . scenes of our men under fire are taking some of the silly romance out of war, but inevitably they portray only one side of the story.

The Vietnam struggle is indeed many sided. The material herein represents a quick review of some aspects of the U.S. nonmilitary effort in South Vietnam, in which USIA is directly and intimately involved.

INCREASE DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

(Mr. KASTENMEIER (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to give the Department of Agriculture the additional authority it needs to increase dairy support levels.

The falloff in milk output, which began last year, has hastened the disappearance of a national surplus that already was dwindling. The total milk production for 1965 fell to some 125 billion pounds, a drop of 1½ percentage points from the 1964 level. The January 1966 figures indicate an even more drastic decline. The reports for that month show that the total U.S. milk production fell 5.3 percent below the year ago level. The decline was far more alarming in the top two milk producing States—a 7-percent drop in Wisconsin, the No. 1 producing State, and a 14-percent decline in the No. 2 producer, Minnesota.

The Department of Agriculture's count of the Nation's dairy herd reported a January total of 16.6 million. This is 5.6 percent less than the previous year and the largest year-to-year percentage decline on record.

The current dairy price support is 75 percent of parity—some \$3.24 a hundred for 3.7 milk. This price has been in effect since April 1, 1965. A new support level will be announced for the new marketing year that starts April 1, 1966.

Mr. Speaker, unless price supports are raised, there simply is not enough incentive, at the current price support level, for the farmer to remain in dairying. Tempted by soaring meat prices, many dairymen have switched to the feeding of cattle or the raising of hogs. Others have left farming entirely to take advantage of the industrial boom and other off-the-farm opportunities. The exodus from dairy farming reached an alarming rate of an estimated 12 departures a day in Wisconsin during 1965.

The present support price is much too low to allow for a reasonable return on labor and investment. Furthermore, if the current downward trends of dairy production continue, we will be faced with acute shortages of milk and dairy products.

Under current legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture is limited in his action to set the support price. The price he must set, under the law, is simply the price that will assure an adequate supply of milk during the next marketing year.

My bill would broaden the price setting power by directing the Secretary of Agriculture to take into consideration the present supply factor as well as three additional related factors in the setting of a price support level somewhere between 75 and 90 percent of parity.

The four factors, then, to be considered would be, first, the supply of milk in relation to the demand; second, the importance of milk to agriculture and the national economy; third, the ability to dispose of stocks of dairy products acquired through price support operations; and fourth, the need of dairy farmers for a fair return on their labor and investment.

This bill is designed to provide what is needed to meet the current crisis—more administrative discretion in dealing with the present slump in dairy production.

March 15, 1966

If we hope to reverse the current dairying trends, we must have higher support levels in order to assure an adequate income for the dairy farmer. In the absence of increased price supports, we may well confront a situation in which dairy production continues to drastically decline and dairy prices rise to inflationary proportions.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION'S RURAL RENEWAL PROGRAM

(Mr. BANDSTRA (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which, if enacted into law, would greatly improve the effectiveness of a rural renewal program being conducted by the Farmers Home Administration in the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This legislation is of particular importance to Appanoose and Monroe Counties in Iowa, since these two counties comprise one of five areas in the United States now designated as eligible for rural renewal assistance.

The basic purpose of this program is to stimulate long-range economic development in rural areas where family incomes are relatively low. The program itself is sound and constructive, but the legislation under which it was established is badly in need of improvement.

Under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the Farmers Home Administration was authorized to allocate rural renewal loan funds to "local public agencies" in designated areas. These local public agencies, in turn, would then make long-term rural renewal loans to private individuals or groups.

Examples of projects which might be undertaken and financed with rural renewal loan funds, under existing law, are as follows:

- Purchase of small tracts of land, consolidation of the tracts, and resale as family-sized farms or for nonfarm use;

- Purchase of large tracts of land for subdivision and resale as family-sized farms or for nonfarm use;

- Development of a reservoir or system of reservoirs for flood control, conservation, recreation, and water supply;

- Construction of water and sewer systems and service buildings, when required to make possible a broad land-use improvement project;

- Purchase of scrub timber land and its development, including timber stand improvement, construction of access roads and conservation measures; and

- Purchase and development of a grazing area for use by ranchers and farmers.

The potential of this comprehensive program has been recognized by the local citizens in Appanoose and Monroe Counties. In an effort to take advantage of the program, they formed the Appanoose-Monroe County Rural Development Corp. In 1964, the organization published a detailed 125 page report, pointing out the rural development needs of the two-county area.

However, because of restrictive language in the existing law, the organization in Appanoose and Monroe Counties has been unable to make any rural renewal loans. The problem arises from the limitation that these loans can be made only by "local public agencies."

This difficulty is not confined to Iowa. The Farmers Home Administration, in addition to my home State, has designated rural renewal areas in Arkansas—Little River and Sevier Counties; Florida—Washington, Holmes, and Walton Counties; North Carolina—Clay, Graham, and Cherokee Counties; and West Virginia—Hardy and Mineral Counties.

Only in Arkansas and North Carolina have the State legislatures passed the necessary enabling legislation allowing establishment of "local public agencies" to administer rural renewal programs. Thus three of the five designated areas cannot benefit from the program.

Under the bill I am introducing today, this problem would be resolved by amending the existing law to allow "local nonprofit organizations," as well as "local public agencies," to make rural renewal loans.

If this legislation becomes law, it would enable the Appanoose-Monroe County Rural Development Corp. to move ahead with a rural renewal program in the two-county area. It would also clear the way for action in present and future designated areas where "local public agencies" cannot be formed.

There is ample precedent for this legislation. Local nonprofit organizations are authorized to conduct programs established under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. I can see no reason why such organizations should not be allowed to administer a rural renewal program.

The bill which I am introducing also would amend the present law to permit the use of rural renewal loans for the development of recreational facilities. This would greatly enhance the economic potential of the existing program, since recreational activities can be an effective source of new income for rural areas.

Appanoose and Monroe Counties, for example, will benefit greatly from the recreational development at the Rathbun Reservoir. The 11,000-acre reservoir, which will cover portions of the two counties, is expected to attract about 1 million visitors a year. If rural renewal loans could be used for recreational development on land near the reservoir, it would result in an even greater economic stimulus for the two-county area.

I am hopeful that the Congress will act favorably on this legislation. The rural renewal program can be of great value to Appanoose and Monroe Counties, as well as other areas in the Nation, but only if the existing law is amended to remove unnecessary limitations.

HUDSON RIVER

(Mr. DANIELS (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ORTINGER], who has worked so hard and long for the Hudson River, and more than a score of Members from New Jersey and New York, in introducing legislation which will authorize the Secretary of the Interior to begin negotiations leading up to an interstate compact for the Hudson River.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional district which I represent is adjacent to the Hudson River. As a matter of fact, the 14th District lies entirely within the boundaries of a county which has received its name from the river which is the very lifeblood of our area. The people of Hudson County need the Hudson River restored and it is time that action is taken to see that the resources of this great artery are protected by Federal as well as State and local action.

I commend the gentleman from Westchester County, N.Y. [Mr. ORTINGER] for the tremendous leadership he has shown in his struggle to preserve and redevelop the Hudson River. The bipartisan approach he has taken in this matter is a credit to the people of Westchester County who have sent him to the Congress. The people of Westchester can take pride in their unusually able Representative. Few Members have made the fine impression upon colleagues on both sides of the aisle that he has made in his first term. The people of our part of the United States will always be indebted to him for his tireless efforts in behalf of the Hudson River.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that all levels of government work together to restore the Hudson River. This river is vital to the very existence of our part of the Nation, but I would not want to leave the impression that this is a local bill of interest only to New Jersey and New York Members. On the contrary, the Hudson River is a keystone of the Nation's economy and the future of the United States is inextricably linked with the future of this river.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot overstate the need for action to save the Hudson. This bill which I have introduced today will, in my view, assist the Federal Government to promote negotiations between the two States involved as well as provide interim protection for the Hudson while these negotiations are proceeding. I urge prompt action on this bill.

A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE RABBI MORRIS ADLER

(Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the city of Detroit has been greatly saddened by the loss of one of her most distinguished scholars, theologians, and civic leader. Death came to Rabbi Morris Adler on March 11, a month after he was shot by one of the young people whom he loved so well. The tragic attack upon Rabbi Adler in the new synagogue of the Shaar

I recall that within recent weeks Senator Long of Louisiana said on the Senate floor, that, as he walked about our Capitol his chest swelled a little every time he saw the Stars and Stripes flying from a pole. With all of the controversy over Vietnam, and in general a healthy discussion of such a subject is a proper function of the Congress, it sometimes seems as though the virtue of patriotism is going out of style. As I wrote in my recent newsletter to constituents quoting Tennyson:

There is no such thing as a good war or a bad peace.

No one wants to see bloodshed on the jungle-tangled plains of South Vietnam. Americans are constituted, by our past history and military glories, to fight a war as quickly as possible, win it as quickly as possible, and settle back to peace as quickly as possible. Unfortunately the war in Vietnam is not that kind of a war.

Surely no one in this entire Nation feels more pain when reading the casualty lists each day than the President of the United States. He must face, in his high office, the agonizing decisions that can and will affect the human life of Americans over there. I do not envy him that task. I do not find it easy myself to hear and read of boys from my district who have been wounded or killed in this frustrating struggle but the United States is committed to the cause of freedom, in southeast Asia, and everywhere else. To waver or back off from that commitment is as unthinkable as surrendering to Adolf Hitler or Mussolini would have been in my days of military service.

The discussion of the best course to be followed for resolution of this bloody struggle will and must go on. But there is some stage at which our use of free speech and open discussion becomes a transgression on good commonsense. There are times, certainly, when it can even come close to giving aid and comfort to the enemy. At least the discussion in the Halls of Congress revolves around resolution of the problem, not total avoidance of it. I am sure that a number of my colleagues presently sitting in this Hall would be hard pressed to remember exactly when the resolve came upon them to take up public service as a career. But I would bet my bottom dollar that it occurred to many of them while in military service or shortly thereafter.

It does seem logical enough that after skimming hedgerows in France or landing on sandy Anzio Beach or pushing through the steaming and rotting jungles of an Okinawa or Guadacanal that you think to yourself—"Let us go back and make something of this land of ours." Surely it was said in a thousand different ways and each and every day in this Chamber we have our differences as to what the best road is to that better land of ours. But we each seek our own truths and do the best we can. And that best in so many cases originally stemmed from a feeling of pride in the service we had given, as we should, to our country.

While it is the flags flying on Capitol flagpoles that give the distinguished Sen-

ator from Louisiana a slightly swelling chest, it is the recent action of two of our Governors, in States other than my own, who give me a feeling of pride. As I say, as a former boxer myself, that it is the actions of the heavyweight champion of the United States or the world, as it may be defined today, turns my stomach and leads me to recall those days in France with even more pride. I am not a hero. I am not a superpatriot. But I feel that each man, if he really is a man, owes to his country a willingness to protect it and serve it in time of need. I think, further, that that debt or obligation is proportional to what this Nation has given to the individual. The more he has received the more the Nation can reasonably expect, if not in actual service, for there may be legitimate reasons or limitations, at least in public mein or attitude.

From this standpoint the heavyweight champion has been a complete and total disgrace to the land that has provided him with the opportunities to make millions of dollars. I applaud the action of the Governors of Illinois and Maine in rejecting out of hand, the appearance of such an ingrate within the boundaries of their States. Surely such a production must necessarily bring some revenue to their States but what price glory. Is there a price tag that can be placed on the coffins being loaded on ships off Vietnam?

It is encouraging to see that men of courage and vision and above all patriotism sit in the statehouses of this Nation. It is almost totally discouraging to see a man who has reaped the profits of the public say this war is not his war. Is it my war? Is it President Johnson's war? It is, everyone's war—and we hope that just as soon as possible it will be no war at all.

But until that time it is an effort on the part of all of the American people. And the heavyweight champion should bear an equal share of that load. There is no citizen of this land who deserves better or worse when it comes to rights, privileges, or duties. But they all go together. Who is he, or any other citizen of any race, creed, color or denomination, to have the right to march to the sound of different drums.

I laud the intention of the American Legion to picket any theater in this Nation that shows this man's next fight whenever it is held, if at all. I further urge that the Legion be joined by the VFW, the Spanish American Veterans, the veterans of all of our wars, organized or not. Further than that I urge the citizens of the Nation as a whole to boycott any of his performances. To leave these theater seats empty would be the finest tribute possible to that boy whose hearse may pass by the open doors of the theater on Main Street, U.S.A.

And I am not talking about black or white. I am talking about green. The Green Berets that move quietly through the devastated overgrowth of South Vietnam. And I am talking about red. Not the red blood that may flow from this man's opponent's nose and spill on a canvas at \$1,000 an ounce. But the red blood of Americans, black and white, that

spills on the foreign ground of a southeast Asian nation in the cause of freedom, without an inflated price tag. And I am talking about blue. Not the blue-black of boxing shorts or the blue-hued purple shorts of a man who can hardly be called a champion after his recent utterances. But rather the tattered and torn blue Navy uniform of a boy blown from the deck of his ship off the shores of that distant land and continent.

I hope the citizens of this land will rise up in righteous indignation and take the money they would have spent at the box office and send it to CARE or some other worthy charity. But above all I hope that each and every seat of each and every theater will stand empty in tribute to our men in Vietnam. I hope the voice of the announcer coming from Toronto or wherever and whenever another of his fights may be held will ricochet all over the walls of those empty theaters just as the bullets ricochet around the helmeted heads of our fighting men. Only in this way we say to these men "we will not tolerate those who are unwilling to serve our Nation." We must, and should, grant anyone the right of free speech, unless and until it becomes seditious. But can we do less for those men who are fighting and dying for this Nation in a foreign land. Let us grant them their equal time and the right to free speech by an overwhelming and stunning silence. The silence of hundreds of empty theaters.

VN

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam is the most important and difficult problem which confronts us today. The situation is complex. The solutions are not simple or clear cut, and the efforts to substitute negotiations for shooting are not entirely within the control of any single government.

Learned observers disagree as to just how this war developed, and historians of the future will debate the wisdom of specific policy decisions of the past 12 years. The one thing on which all reasonable men can agree is that we want to end this war, with its terrible toll of lives and its tremendous drain on the resources of this and other countries, as soon as possible.

We seek peace and we seek independence and freedom for men to determine their own future. We prefer to achieve these goals by peaceful means. We prefer to work out at the conference table the means by which the Vietnamese people can freely establish their own government, build their own society and develop their own economy.

If our present efforts to achieve negotiations and a cease-fire through the United Nations, or through a reconvened Geneva Conference, are unsuccessful, I believe we must continue energetically and persistently to persuade our opponents that we desire not war but peace; that we desire neither personal gain, military bases nor political dependence.

"Her concern for the innocent parents of her husband's assailant was in itself a measure of her great character and spirit.

"To Congregation Shaarey Zedek, in its crushing loss, the Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches expresses its profound sympathy and the hope that the example of the noble leadership of this prophet of God might long remain as a source of challenge and inspiration."

LEADING CITIZEN

The Right Reverend Richard S. Emrich, bishop of the Episcopal diocese of Michigan, said:

"Detroit has lost one of its leading citizens and I personally have lost a dear friend.

"We honor a man chiefly by carrying on his work. One statement of Rabbi Adler's that I clearly recall was, 'Remember that silence can be a sin.'

"Let any of us who see injustice in the world remember Rabbi Adler's statement—and fight for justice."

Edward L. Cushman, vice president of American Motors Corp., said:

"Rabbi Morris Adler's death is a tremendous loss to all of us who knew and worked with him in community betterment.

"He was a man of wisdom and deep concern for all sorts and conditions of men," including businessmen.

"Since 1956 he had served as a member of the clergy panel, which has advised American Motors management on moral and ethical matters involving corporate human relations. He will be sorely missed."

LOSS FELT BY ALL

The Detroit District of the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, said in a statement:

"Rabbi Adler's death is a loss felt by all of us. He was not only a spokesman for his faith—and a very articulate one—but frequently for the entire community.

"A sensitive concern for people, coupled with outstanding leadership ability, brought him into a warm and respected relationship with those on all levels of city and national life.

"Our heartfelt and deepest sympathies go out to his widow, and all of his 'church family' at Shaarey Zedek."

Because of Rabbi Adler's death, the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation at Wayne State University has canceled plans for a dance at 8 p.m. tomorrow in McKenzie Hall on the university campus.

WORKED AS FRIEND

UAW President Walter P. Reuther, a friend of Rabbi Adler, called his death a "grievous and deeply personal loss." Reuther said:

"To us in the UAW with whom he worked closely and intimately as a friend and colleague, his life will be measured by the timeless qualities which his noble spirit reflected—love of people, social mindedness, courage, and intelligent, unselfish leadership. "He walked in quiet nobility as a man among men."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1966]

RABBI MORRIS ADLER, 59, DIES—SHOT DURING SERVICE ON FEBRUARY 12—DETROIT CONSERVATIVE LEADER HAD BEEN IN A COMA SINCE ATTACK IN SYNAGOGUE

DETROIT, March 11.—Rabbi Morris Adler, spiritual leader of Detroit's largest Conservative Jewish congregation, died early today in Sinai Hospital, where he had been in a coma since he was shot February 12 during a Sabbath service in Congregation Shaarey Zedek. He was 59 years old.

With him when he died were his wife, the former Jennie Resnick, and his daughter, Mrs. Shulamith Benstein.

Rabbi Adler had suffered brain damage from a bullet wound in the head. His condition had worsened during the last several days despite two brain operations.

His attacker, 23-year-old Richard Wish-

netsky, who had a record of mental illness, shot himself moments after he had shot the rabbi and died 4 days later.

Today, Gov. George Romney declared Sunday as a day of mourning for Rabbi Adler throughout Michigan.

A DISTINGUISHED EDUCATOR

Rabbi Adler, prominently identified with Conservative Judaism, was one of the country's most distinguished Jewish educators. His lectures and writings were known here and in Jewish communities the world over.

He often decried the absence of "creative conservatism" among the different philosophies of Judaism, and "the gaps and misunderstanding and resentment" that threatened Jewish community life.

Once, in a lecture, he termed as "an irony of American Jewish life in our times" that when new forms of communication have linked the world "the Jewish community has seemed to have lost its capacity for communicating across denominational and ideological lines."

With an almost around-the-clock devotion, Rabbi Adler toiled in behalf of adult Jewish education. Since 1963, he had served as chairman of the highly influential Adult Jewish Education Commission of B'nai B'rith.

In 1964, he initiated an experiment in Jewish adult education that linked 14 study groups in 13 cities for a lecture and discussion by telephone. The project was sponsored by B'nai B'rith. Rabbi Adler conducted the experiment from his study of Congregation Shaarey Zedek in Detroit on the subject: "Will Jews Be Jews in 2084?"

In addition to writing on numerous articles on every phase of Jewish life, he was the author of two books, "Selected Passages From the Torah," published in 1948, and the "World of the Torah" (1953).

Rabbi Adler was born in Russia, the son of Rabbi Joseph Adler, and came to this country in 1913. He was graduated from City College in 1928, was ordained a rabbi at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in 1935 and was given honorary degrees by Wayne State University, where he had been an adviser to its department of New Eastern languages and literature.

His first pulpit was at Temple Emanu-El in Buffalo, from 1935 until 1938, when he went to Detroit. From 1943 to 1946 he served in the Army.

He directed the building of the \$4.5 million synagogue in Detroit, which was dedicated in 1962 and is considered to be one of the largest of its kind in the Conservative movement.

Rabbi Adler was a close friend of Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers. He was a member of the Michigan Fair Election Practices Commission and of the Labor-Management Citizens Commission.

In recent years, he had been active in the roundtable of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews and was considered a leading spokesman for the Jewish community in Detroit.

Last September he returned to Detroit after a year's sabbatical leave in Israel.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1966]

ASSASSIN'S BULLET FATAL TO RABBI MORRIS ADLER

DETROIT, March 11.—Rabbi Morris Adler died today, victim of an assassin—a young man with a twisted mind—who gunned him down nearly a month ago during a service at his synagogue.

Gov. George Romney declared a day of mourning for all of Michigan Sunday.

A Russian immigrant who rose to leadership of one of the Nation's most powerful and respected congregations, Rabbi Adler, 59, died of complications resulting from the coma he entered 27 days ago when Richard Wishnetsky shot him in his head.

He never regained consciousness. Doctors

at Sinai Hospital had performed two operations but extensive brain damage made the battle almost hopeless. They warned Tuesday night that the end was near.

Wishnetsky, 23, a Phi Beta Kappa scholar whose writings revealed a mind torn between flashes of genius and pits of darkness, died February 16 of the the bullet wound he inflicted upon himself moments after he shot Rabbi Adler.

The shooting occurred during a bar mitzvah service. Wishnetsky jumped to the platform and denounced the congregation, saying he was "ashamed" to be a Jew. The audience, including members of other faiths invited for an ecumenical experiment, watched in horror as Wishnetsky fired two shots at the Rabbi and then shot himself.

Romney said Rabbi Adler "was a good personal friend. His advice and counsel on ethical and moral matters were a constant source of help to me for many years in industry and public life."

United Auto Workers Union President Walter Reuther said Rabbi Adler "walked in quiet nobility as a man among men. His good works will live long after him. And we who grieve for him are better for having shared his friendship, his compassion, and his affection."

Rabbi Adler served on the union's public review board since 1957. He was also a strong spokesman for civil rights and a former national chairman of the B'nai B'rith Commission on Adult Jewish Education.

In Washington, Dr. William A. Wexler, president of the B'nai B'rith, in a statement this morning, said: "The Jewish community has suffered the loss of one of its most distinguished scholars whose passion for righteousness, incisive brilliance of learning, compassion for the troubles of others and capacity to articulate goodness and wisdom were harmoniously combined in a wonderful human being."

A delegation of high officials of the Jewish service organization, including members of its adult Jewish education commission, will fly to Detroit to attend the funeral service on Sunday at Shaarey Zedek, the multi-million-dollar synagogue Rabbi Adler built in suburban Southfield—the temple from which he was carried February 12.

(Mr. BOLAND (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BOLAND'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

A HEAVYWEIGHT CHAMPION?

(Mr. CLARK (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, it was a cloudy morning, and quite cool over the flat, bush-filled fields of France that day in 1944. It was, or at least seems like, a long time ago. From my pilot's seat the window of the glider was semi-frosted and the land seemed to be passing by so fast that it was but a blur as the glider descended. Mr. Speaker, I do not know as I compile these remarks to my colleagues that I can be completely dispassionate or entirely objective. For I want these remarks really to project a feeling I have for this land of ours that first, I would suppose, occurred to me over the fields of France some two decades ago.

I believe we must continue our efforts to persuade them, through every direct and indirect recourse at our command, that we desire only a conference without preconditions, an effective cease-fire and self-determination for the South Vietnamese.

In the meantime, we must use our military force with prudence and restraint. We must limit it to the measured response which will prevent the other side from achieving its goal of domination, and we must guard wisely against the kind of escalation which could bring China into the war.

One of the responsibilities of a Member of Congress is to see that his views, and the views of his constituents, are made known to our policymakers. This responsibility I have pursued repeatedly. In statements to the House and in conferences with members of the administration I have expressed my views and the deep concerns of many of my constituents.

Since last summer I have advocated, both publicly and privately, that the full resources of the United Nations be brought to bear in seeking a peaceful settlement. I have advocated negotiations based on the Geneva accords and including all parties to the conflicts.

I joined in the preparation and circulation of a letter to the President on January 21, signed by 77 Members of the House, urging this country to formally request the U.N. to seek an effective cease-fire; supporting the moratorium on bombing North Vietnam; and encouraging continued efforts to bring the war to the conference table.

On March 1, I presented a statement to the House in behalf of 78 Members, stressing that our vote for a supplemental authorization to support our troops was not a mandate for unrestrained or unrestricted enlargement of the war, but rather was cast in the context of the Presidents' assurance that our objectives were limited and designed to bring about a cease-fire and negotiations.

In separate remarks to the House on the same day, based in part on my just completed 5-day inspection trip to Vietnam, I emphasized my belief that we must intensify our efforts to find a peaceful settlement of this war. I stated that I shared many of the doubts and questions raised by such distinguished men as Senator FULBRIGHT, General Gavin, and Ambassador Kennan, and that we must not overlook any reasonable diplomatic initiative.

I again warned against the risk of taking military steps which, in an attempt to hasten victory, might bring on a still larger war. And I emphasized the importance of encouraging our policy planners to make clear that we would negotiate with all those who are actively engaged in carrying on this war.

In this connection, it is pertinent to mention that as far back as August 9, 1965, Congressmen HENRY REUSS and I, in a television broadcast on channel 2, Oakland, stated that we should negotiate with all the people who are shooting at us, including the Vietcong.

I would also like to make it clear that

I endorse the present open hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and applaud the committee's efforts to throw more light on our policy and relationships with Communist China.

As a former labor negotiator, I know that practical realities limit the extent to which conferees can unilaterally announce in advance what positions they will take if and when the other side agrees to talk. Our Government has repeatedly said, in public announcements and in private communications, that it imposes no prior limitations or preconditions on what can be discussed or negotiated. Much as we would like the President and other officials to spell out more details, we must recognize that the success of their efforts is even more important.

Many have asked why the other side persists in fighting if we have made clear our willingness to negotiate and to abide by the results of free elections. I do not know the answer, and the questions trouble me, too.

Perhaps our opponents expect to win militarily and deliberately reject the risks of free elections.

Perhaps they do not believe us, or perhaps they mistrust the Saigon Government.

Possibly the discourse between Hanoi, Moscow, and Peiping involves complexities and conflicts which require more time to resolve.

Whatever the stumbling blocks, we must tirelessly seek to overcome them. With the dangers of a larger and much more costly war on one hand, and the unmet needs of our own society on the other, the stakes are simply too great not to make every reasonable and practical effort.

The decisionmaking process in a democracy involves the study and counsel of many advisers. Inevitably they will vary in their views as to which course is wisest.

For my part I shall continue to urge, by whatever means my judgment indicates will be most effective under the circumstances, that we adhere to our announced policy of a firm but limited military resistance; that we encourage long-needed economic and social reforms; that we search tirelessly for some means of bringing this conflict from the battlefields to the conference table; and that we support free elections, under appropriate international safeguards, so that the people of Vietnam may truly and independently determine their own future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted the following Members (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

Mr. MATHIAS, for today, on account of illness.

Mr. REINECKE, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. ELLSWORTH, for today, on account of illness.

Mr. MOORE, for today, on account of family illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 16, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, March 17, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee), for 30 minutes, on Friday, March 18, 1966; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. OLSEN of Montana in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIKES in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances and to include in one an address by the late Honorable Eugene Cox, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$381.33, and in the other to include newspaper articles.

Mr. ALBERT and to include letters from the President of the United States and newspaper articles.

Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$520.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. GUBSER in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. QUILEN.

Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in five instances.

Mr. RUMSFELD in three instances.

Mr. MOORE in four instances.

Mr. MAILLIARD.

Mr. KUPFERMAN in five instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

March 15, 1966

Mr. McDADE.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM in five instances.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD.
Mr. PELLY in three instances.
Mr. PRELINGHUYSEN.
Mr. SKUBITZ.
Mr. SHRIVER.
Mr. STANTON in three instances.
Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. KEITH.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PUCINSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ST. ONGE in three instances.
Mr. GARMATZ.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.
Mrs. GRIFFITHS.
Mr. MURPHY of New York.
Mr. ANNUNZIO.
Mr. CALLAN in two instances.
Mr. MULTER in three instances.
Mr. NEDZI in two instances.
Mr. SLACK.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER in four instances.
Mr. ABBITT in three instances.
Mr. JOELSON in two instances.
Mr. SMITH of Iowa in four instances.
Mrs. MINK in two instances.
Mr. TRIMBLE.
Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.
Mr. CAREY in two instances.
Mr. TUCK in two instances.
Mr. HENDERSON.
Mr. FEIGHAN.
Mr. McGRATH.
Mr. KASTENMEIER in four instances.
Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania.
Mr. BANDSTRA in three instances.
Mr. BOLAND in two instances.
Mr. HAGAN of Georgia in two instances.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2719. An act to provide for the striking of metals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2831. An act to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2835. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the American Numismatic Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution to approve the selection of the U.S. Olympic Committee and to support its recommendations that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2614. An act to provide for U.S. participation in the 1967 statewide celebration of the centennial of the Alaska Purchase.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 432. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3584. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines;

H.R. 8030. An act to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12752. An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 14, 1966, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12889. An act to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, research, development, test, evaluation, and military construction for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 16, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2180. A letter from the chief scout executive, National Council, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the 56th annual report of the growth and effectiveness of the Boy Scouts of America, for the year 1965 (H. Doc. No. 410); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2181. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation for the Post Office Department for "Transportation" for the fiscal year 1966, had

been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2182. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation for the Post Office Department for "Operations" for the fiscal year 1966, had been reapportioned on a basis indicating a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriations to provide for certain increased pay costs and for handling a greater mail volume, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2183. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota, has been completed as a part of the investigations required in the formulation of a definite plan for project development, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83-172; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2184. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2185. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and the Army General Staff on December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2186. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improvements in the management of moneys held in trust for Indians, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2187. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of loan program financial statements for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964, Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2188. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of need for improved procedures for determining ability of patients and responsible relatives to pay for care at St. Elizabeths Hospital, Department of Public Health, District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2189. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the management of inventories by the Army Map Service, Washington, D.C., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2190. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the relocation of railroad facilities, Walter F. George lock and dam, Fort Gaines, Ga., Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2191. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of possible savings in ocean transportation costs for surplus agricultural commodities donated under titles II and III, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Agency for International Development, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2192. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Virgin Islands Corporation, transmitting the annual report of the Virgin Islands

created new taxpaying farms, and new homes and business enterprises around the nucleus of the dam.

Madam President, these benefits of reclamation on the ECHO project are pictured and described in the February issue of Reclamation News. Although the photos cannot be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to print the article in full.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECHO PROJECT PAYS OUT—PLUS

As the Federal Government devises and finances ways to the Great Society, the potential of western irrigation merits special consideration because: Irrigation, while furthering the aims of the Great Society, has the following advantages. It is reimbursable, and therefore, a minimal drain on the hard-pressed taxpayer. It motivates through the sharing of risk, creates long-lasting capital assets, and provides needed consumer products. It develops water resources which will finally demand full attention regardless of other social actions.

A case to illustrate is the Echo project, above Ogden, Utah, for which construction funds were advanced nearly 30 years ago. This week the Weber River Water Users Association completed repayment of the Federal funds invested. But that is only part of the story.

During the payout period, jobs have been created and people trained to fill them. Fruit, vegetables, eggs, poultry, and meat have been produced for local use and export. The water users have paid taxes on land made more valuable by irrigation. They have collected profits, and induced others to invest in supporting facilities. And together they—the water users and the goods-and-services people—have built healthy, comfortable communities.

Or examine Echo's success and its contributions another way. Consider the evils avoided by the Federal assistance that made possible the Echo project. The farmers, stock and poultry men, truckers, railroaders, warehousemen, food processors, tradesmen, professionals, and others who are at work because of Echo would have been competing elsewhere for jobs. Their competition would have contributed to the demands for rent subsidization, slum clearance, job training, and similar measures of poverty alleviation, measures which may neither create jobs to match the training, nor cure the causes leading to rent subsidization. Thus, projects providing for irrigation in the West avert many social ills by providing an economic base of permanence.

And those benefits go on and on. In the year 2000, Echo project will be giving employment, directly and indirectly. It will be providing food demanded by larger populations, yielding taxes, and furnishing to all visitors the vistas of green pastures and flowering orchards. But this did not occur without planning; Echo was first thought of 60 years ago.

And so, while stating our thanks to the Congress, to the Bureau of Reclamation, and those bankers who financed private credits, let us be mindful of this fact in the creation of major public works; time is a dimension. How important a dimension? From the table below you can see for Echo the time between idea and reality.

Today, the continuing development of water resources makes each new concept more complex, and the risk and the cost of mistakes much greater. Considering the increasing complexity, together with the past crises overcome at great expense, and near crises barely avoided, one concludes that the time for effective planning for the future is now.

Postponement because of Vietnam, or deferment in favor of other courses toward the Great Society, would only force a later crash planning program to meet crises thereby made inevitable. Let us avoid that evil and, instead, pursue the goal of optimum economic benefit through comprehensive planning on an orderly and timely basis.

TIME, AS REQUIRED FOR THE ECHO PROJECT
Year 1904: Reconnaissance of reservoir areas.
Year 1905: Construction of stream-gaging stations.
Year 1922: Preliminary site surveys.
Year 1937: Going farms and ranches.
Year 1924: Appropriation for detailed planning and design.
Year 1927: Initiation of construction.
Year 1932: Beneficial use of water.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AMERICAN BANKS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I have good news which indicates that efforts by individual Senators sometimes get results. On the 25th of February, at a hearing of the Finance Committee, I urged upon the Secretary of the Treasury that we seek to have American banks set up in South Vietnam so that American expenditures would not go into the Bank of Indochina and thus be used as a means of constituting a gold drain from the United States.

The President and the Treasury Department have moved with great speed on this suggestion, and on the 9th of March the South Vietnamese Government authorized the establishment of two branches of American banks in South Vietnam. As I understand, they are the Chase Manhattan Bank and the Bank of America.

This is a great step forward, and if the dollar expenditures of our Government in South Vietnam are routed to these banks, and away from the Bank of Indochina, we will have a further potential saving in gold drain of probably not less than \$500 million a year.

I want to commend the President and the Secretary of the Treasury and the Government of South Vietnam for moving with speed in this matter, and to suggest that it indicates that this administration is ready to receive and respond to constructive suggestions.

AMA AT LAST APOLOGIZES AND PAYS DAMAGES TO STEELWORKER LEADER IT MALIGNED IN 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, on November 21, 1963—page 22581 of the RECORD—I called the attention of the Senate to a fraudulent representation which the American Medical Association was making in its all-out war against enactment of health-care-for-the-aged legislation.

I inserted in the RECORD a New York Times article describing the AMA's distribution of copies of a phonograph record—which on its face was fraudulent—which the AMA said was a recording of a speech by Mr. Paul Normile, director of District 16 of the United Steelworkers of America, to a union meeting. The recording portrayed the union leader in gangsterlike fashion and had him threaten the audience to make contribu-

tions in behalf of medicare. Apparently the AMA hoped to encourage stronger, and better financed, opposition to medicare legislation by playing this recording to antimedicare meetings.

I made this matter a point of discussion in the Senate because I thought Mr. Normile was being unfairly attacked for his legitimate support of pending legislation—I went into the matter at some length—and because I wanted to be sure that the Congress and the people were aware of the tactics being used by the opponents of medicare.

Madam President, the newspapers have reported over the weekend that the AMA has not only publicly apologized to Mr. Normile for distributing the spurious record, but has also made a substantial financial settlement out of court.

I regret that it took so long to clear up this matter for I think the Congress has a responsibility to see that fraudulent methods of lobbying or intimidating proponents of legislation are exposed before, not after, the legislative questions involved are resolved. But I am very glad to see that Mr. Normile's name has been cleared and the responsibility for these fraudulent methods has been admitted.

Madam President, although this matter occurred over 2 years ago and medicare is now law, I think the record should be filled out, and so I ask unanimous consent that an article from the AFL-CIO newspaper, an article from the March 12, 1966, edition of the Washington Post and John Herling's article in today's Washington Daily News be printed in the RECORD.

First I call attention to the final paragraph of the second article, which reads:

During court proceedings 2 years ago, an AMA official's affidavit disclosed he had bought the recording for \$20 in 1963 from a middleman sent by a man known to him only as Irv, who had described himself as a disgruntled union member.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the AFL-CIO News, Mar. 12, 1966]
AMA ISSUES RETRACTION IN NORMILE LIBEL SUIT

The American Medical Association has issued the following statement:

"In March 1963, the American Medical Association was sent a tape recording of what purported to be a political fund-raising speech made in Pennsylvania by a Pittsburgh labor leader, Mr. Paul Normile, director of District 16, United Steelworkers of America. Believing in good faith that the tape recording was authentic, the AMA reproduced it and the American Medical Political Action Committee produced and distributed a booklet, entitled 'The Voice of COPE,' containing the text of the speech and a phonograph record made from the tape as evidence of the tactics which they believed labor used in support of its objectives.

"Mr. Normile thereafter filed a lawsuit alleging that he never made the speech in question. Distribution of the tapes and records was immediately voluntarily discontinued pending full investigation of his contention. As a result of its exhaustive investigation, the AMA is now satisfied that Mr. Normile did not make the speech in question. In fairness to him, the statement that he did so is retracted. Furthermore, all copies of the tape recording and the

AMPAC booklet and record in the possession of AMA or AMPAC have been destroyed. To prevent further playing of the recording, it is urged that any person having a copy of either the tape or the record take similar action. The AMA sincerely regrets the error."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 12, 1966]

STEELWORKER LEADER GETS AMA APOLOGY (By Frank C. Porter)

The American Medical Association publicly apologized yesterday for circulating a spurious phonograph record. The voice on the record purported to represent a labor leader threatening members who failed to contribute to a promedicare campaign.

The retraction was part of an out-of-court settlement of a \$400,000 libel suit brought by the labor leader, Paul Normile, director of District 16, United Steelworkers of America.

The AMA also agreed to pay Normile \$25,000, sources close to the case said.

David E. Feller, former Steelworkers general counsel who represented Normile, had called the record a complete fabrication. He said it portrayed Normile as "a semi-literate moron . . . and thug" who was violating his trust to union members.

The AMA's retraction was carried on page 1 of the AFL-CIO News yesterday and will be published in the next issue of the American Medical Journal.

"As a result of its exhaustive investigation," the statement read in part, "the AMA is now satisfied that Mr. Normile did not make the speech in question."

"In fairness to him, the statement that he did so is retracted. Furthermore, all copies of the tape recording and the AMPAC (American Medical Political Action Committee) booklet and record in possession of AMA or AMPAC have been destroyed."

"To prevent further playing of the recording, it is urged that any person having a copy of either the tape or the record take similar action. The AMA sincerely regrets the error."

During court proceedings 2 years ago, an AMA official's affidavit disclosed he had bought the recording for \$20 in 1963 from a middleman sent by a man known to him only as Irv, who had described himself as a disgruntled union member.

AMA SLIP WAS SHOWING (By John Herling)

The American Medical Association has just had to eat crow, apologize to a union leader, and pay \$25,000 to settle a libel suit.

The AMA was caught in political malpractice and they are so sorry. Under the settlement, the AMA will have to print its apology in the next issue of the AMA Journal.

The story broke in November, 1963, when Paul Normile, director of District 16 of the United Steel Workers, learned that functionaries of the AMA were distributing through medical society channels, a disc which purported to be a recording of a speech made by him before a union meeting. In this speech, the voice was heard bellowing at union members to "come across" with their contributions to COPE (the AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education), threatening those who didn't kick in, with the "graveyard shift" and so on. It was a "dese and dese" speech, with plenty of rough talk.

It was a stupid fabrication, as the AMA now admits, although it took them nearly 2½ years to get around to admitting it.

To understand the nature of this exposed fraud one must ask certain questions. Why, for example, should the American Medical Association, the national body of American doctors, be involved in such a shoddy affair? Part of the answer is that the AMA has more than once strayed from its ostensible pur-

pose, which is to encourage the practice of medicine and to enlighten the public about the great achievements of American medicine.

Over the years, the AMA has operated one of the strongest lobbies here and in State capitals. It has sought to block at every turn social and economic legislation, some of which had only the faintest relation to the immediate interests of the practicing physician. But its one big target for the past two decades has been the prevention of any legislation in the field of medical care. By making "crisis" appeals, it has levied assessments on its membership to raise war chests against the "specter" of "slave state" legislation.

Through its own political action committee, the AMA moved into campaigns, furnishing funds to favorite Congressmen and Senators in return for their opposition to liberal legislation. Thus, the AMA made common cause with the National Farm Bureau Federation, the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and any other large scale group with influence on the Hill.

But above all, the AMA recognized the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations as the chief target. At almost every facet, the AFL-CIO's legislative program was poison to the AMA. Whether it was medicare, or minimum wages, or liberalization of unemployment compensation, the AMA lobbyists would throw their weight against legislation.

Finally, came the Normile caper. Apparently the perpetrators of this fraudulent tape recording thought that if they could circulate it fast enough and far enough, the leaders of organized labor could be painted as "semi-illiterate morons and thugs" and violators of their trust to their members and of the law itself. Five thousand such records were manufactured. Many were distributed to local societies and women's auxiliaries.

When a libel suit for \$4 million was filed against the AMA in behalf of Mr. Normile by David Feller, then the general counsel of the United Steel Workers, the AMA fought it at every turn. Now, after considerable reluctance and bargaining back and forth, the AMA admits that no such speech was ever made by Mr. Normile.

It has ordered the destruction of all tapes, recordings and booklets entitled "The Voice of COPE" reproduced by the AMA and the American Medical Political Action Committee. "The AMA sincerely regrets the error," its statement concludes. Meantime, medicare is now part of the law of the land and the AMA is adjusting itself to a new reality and a new diet.

INFLATION: NO. 1 PROBLEM OF AGED-MINORITY VIEWS, COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, this year's annual report by the Senate Special Committee on Aging, being transmitted to the Senate today, includes a statement of minority views signed by Senators CARLSON, WINSTON L. PROUTY, HIRAM L. FONG, GORDON ALLOTT, JACK MILLER, JAMES B. PEARSON, and myself.

The report contains valuable factual material. I invite the attention of every Member of the Senate to both the majority and minority statements.

Because of its timeliness I especially urge review of the minority statement. Among the major considerations to which it directs attention are several

which I feel deserve special comment by me now.

Inflation and loss of real income is the No. 1 problem of older Americans today.

Preventive and corrective action to maintain income adequacy for the elderly in the face of inflation is becoming increasingly necessary.

A halt to unnecessary Federal spending and waste is recommended as a first step in preventing further erosion of dollar values.

Congressional action to compensate for economic injury already suffered by the elderly as a result of inflation appears appropriate without delay.

Purchasing power of a 72-year-old person with a fixed income of \$3,000 a year has been reduced by over \$330 since 1957-59.

There has been an 11-percent rise in the consumer price index over the 1957-59 base as of December 1965. In the past year, the increase was 2.2 percent.

Because of very large price increases for many bare necessities, those with lowest incomes and minimum ability to adjust spending patterns have been hit hardest.

The magnitude of inflation's impact on the elderly is shown by a projection based on the current price-rise rate.

A purchasing power loss of over \$3.5 billion a year will be suffered by persons over 65 by 1971 if the current trend continues.

In the absence of sounder Federal fiscal policies, the loss in dollar values may rise even more rapidly.

It is regrettable, as inflation becomes more severe, that so much of the pressures by Government—actual and contemplated—are those against labor, agriculture, business, and taxpayers generally, while there is resistance by the administration to reasonable requests for reductions in unnecessary Federal spending.

In the face of Vietnam war costs, the need is to halt proliferation of new domestic programs, many of which are of questionable value, and expansion of bureaucracy which has seen a 5-year increase of 200,000 Federal civilian employees.

Equally important are proposals which can ameliorate losses already suffered by older Americans of all income levels.

We call for serious and productive consideration of ways to compensate the elderly for losses suffered through inflation and to strengthen their ability to adjust to the problems inflation creates, including:

First. Automatic cost-of-living increases in social security benefits;

Second. Increases in minimum social security payments;

Third. Extension of social security benefits to more people, young and old;

Fourth. Increase in aged widows' social security to 100 percent of spouse's benefits;

Fifth. Assurance of adequate old-age assistance programs.

It should be noted that the recent 7 percent social security cash benefit increase, adopted with bipartisan support, provides only partial relief for purchas-

March 15, 1966

5669

only \$36,000 in special milk funds for fiscal year 1967, compared with \$174,000 in fiscal year 1966. This estimate for 1967 is based on the estimated use rate in 1966.

Appropriations requested for the school lunch program are \$19 million less than Congress appropriated last year. The 1966 total was \$202 million; the 1967 total, \$183 million.

Proposed reductions total \$101 million.

These reductions are proposed despite rising student enrollment.

In other words, although there are more students, the Federal share of the school lunch and school milk programs would decline, under the President's recommendations.

For years the school lunch and school milk programs have operated efficiently and successfully. They are noncontroversial. Schools in all the States are familiar with these programs. Administration functions smoothly. State and local governments put up \$330 million for school lunches in 1965.

These programs have been an important factor in improving the health of millions of schoolchildren. There can be no doubt about the importance of good nutrition to the learning capacity of young people.

The 1967 budget states that the school lunch program during the peak month in 1965 provided lunches to over 35 percent of the approximately 48.2 million schoolchildren in the country. That would be more than 16.8 million students. In December 1964, according to the budget, the program reached 17 million children in 70,132 schools.

Official estimates show between 24 and 26 million children in 92,000 to 93,000 schools received more than 3 billion half pints of milk under the special school milk program in 1965. Each child paid 3 to 4 cents on the average for a half pint of milk costing 6 to 8 cents total. The milk was distributed during recesses and during other times of the day.

I am very much concerned about the adverse effects of the drastic reductions proposed in these programs.

My concern is shared by the Hawaii State School Food Service Association. Recently, I received a letter from Miss Chieko Okamoto, chairman of the legislative committee of this organization. In her letter, Miss Okamoto pointed out:

If these cuts are not restored at the congressional level, it will mean that the State would be called upon to make up what we will lose in Federal subsidy.

Any chance of getting a bill through our State legislature to take care of this during the present budget session seems very dim. Consequently, all of the cuts must be made up by the children who buy the lunches at the school cafeterias.

Higher lunch prices would mean lower participation and lower participation would mean higher per capita overhead cost. This will cause a vicious cycle, which will mean the deterioration of the school lunch program here in Hawaii, which today is one of the best in the country.

Mr. President, because of the importance of these programs to the school children of America, I include the entire text of Miss Okamoto's letter be printed

in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I have also heard from Mrs. Laura H. Hayashi, cafeteria manager of the Kapunahala Elementary School in Kaneohe, Oahu, Hawaii, who wrote:

It is our hope that the Federal subsidy can be maintained at its present level so that we may continue to serve the children of Hawaii.

HAWAII STATE SCHOOL
FOOD SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
Honolulu, Hawaii, March 4, 1966.

HON. HIRAM L. FONG,
Member of Congress,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FONG: According to the local press and reports coming out of Washington, we have been informed that there will be tremendous cuts in the Federal subsidy as far as the national school lunch program is concerned. As near as we can determine these cuts will total approximately \$100 million.

Because of my connection with the school lunch program in Hawaii, these reports are of great concern to me.

If these cuts are not restored at the congressional level, it will mean that the State would be called upon to make up what we will lose in Federal subsidy.

Any chance of getting a bill through our State legislature to take care of this during the present budget session seems very dim. Consequently, all of the cuts must be made up by the children who buy the lunches at the school cafeterias.

Higher lunch prices would mean lower participation and lower participation would mean higher per capita overhead cost. This will cause a vicious cycle which will mean the deterioration of the school lunch program here in Hawaii, which today is one of the best in the country.

We humbly ask on behalf of the future leaders of our State, the youth of Hawaii, that you make a sincere effort in restoring these budget cuts to the existing levels.

Thank you, mahalo and aloha.

Sincerely,

MISS CHIEKO OKAMOTO,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

THE SUDDEN REDISCOVERY OF SEATO

MR. HARTKE. Mr. President, in recent days there has occurred what the distinguished columnist, Arthur Krock, called in the New York Times of Sunday, March 6, "The Sudden Rediscovery of SEATO."

Mr. Krock relates this new emphasis upon the agreements of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization establishment to the failure of the previous reliance on the Tonkin Bay resolution as the President's cachet of authority for our operations in South Vietnam. Rather than citing the Tonkin Bay resolution, as was done previously in letters both to a group of Congressman and a group of Senators, Secretary Rusk in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee "fell back on the treaty as a sworn national obligation," Mr. Krock notes.

But this too, in the opinion of the distinguished New York Times commentator, is a belated argument which "has since been badly damaged in the critical analysis to which it has been subjected." As evidence, Mr. Krock cites both from the statement of Senator Walter George as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee at the time of

the SEATO Treaty discussion in the Senate, and from the views of persons interviewed by Mr. Krock who participated in drafting the 1954 treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUDDEN REDISCOVERY OF SEATO (By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—The citation by Secretary of State Rusk of the Southeast Asia Treaty of 1954 as the fundamental source of President Johnson's authority to commit the United States to whatever expenditure of manpower and treasure he deems necessary to sustain the war in Vietnam was a shift of emphasis by the administration. And the reason is as plain as the ground is weak.

The reason was that influential senatorial voices were rising in protest against the administration's oft-reiterated claim that the President's open-ended commitment in Vietnam derives from the so-called Gulf of Tonkin concurrent resolution approved by Congress in 1964.

The voices arose from Senators who had been given officially to understand at the time that the resolution would not be so construed by the administration, and some of them had stated this reservation in voting for the measure. It was in the presence of this disturbance that Rusk, in the course of his testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, fell back on the treaty as a sworn national obligation which the President is executing with steadily mounting employment of armed force.

ARGUMENT DAMAGED

This belated argument has since been badly damaged in the critical analysis to which it has been subjected. Mr. Johnson appeared to recognize its vulnerability when he interposed in the debate a reminder that he is also Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, and believes this role gives him the obligation as well as the power to make such use of these forces as he considers essential to preserve the national security when he adjudges it to stand in peril.

Though there are impressive constitutional challengers of this interpretation of Commander in Chief power when the United States is not formally at war, it has been established in previous practice. And the Supreme Court has dismissed all such challenges which have reached it for review.

The actual consequences are that (1) any President can involve the Nation in war and maintain it there indefinitely without the formal declaration which the Constitution reserves as an exclusive power of Congress; and (2) count on the declaration being made when and if his conscience or his political necessity induces him to propose it to Congress.

UTILIZED PROVOCATION

This is a fixed condition, and not a theory. But for obviously practical and technical reasons Presidents do not concede it on the public record. The alternative chosen by Mr. Johnson was to utilize the provocation of the Tonkin Gulf attack on the Seventh Fleet by North Vietnamese gunboats to get a generalized expression of support from Congress. This worked well enough until it was argued, against the public record, as approval by Congress of any expansion of the war the President might make in an unforeseeable future. Then Rusk shifted the major basis for the claim to the SEATO compact.

But extracts from the 1954 Senate debate on the treaty demonstrate the fragility of this claim. In explaining the commitment to the Senate, Chairman George of the Commit-

tee on Foreign Relations made these statements:

The treaty does not call for automatic action; it calls for consultation (with the other signatories). If any course of action shall be agreed * * * or decided upon, then that action must have the approval of Congress, because the constitutional process (of each signatory government) is provided for. * * * It is clear that the threat to territorial integrity and political independence * * * also encompasses acts of subversion. * * * (But) even in that event (the United States) would not be bound to put it down. I cannot emphasize too strongly that we have no obligation * * * to take positive measures of any kind. All we are obligated to do is to consult together about it.

In the debate which followed Rusk's new resort to the treaty, Senator Morse made this point: If the administration is almost unilaterally waging the war on a decision that there has been "an armed attack" (that represents "a common danger") on an independent nation within the treaty's zone of protection, then the treaty requires that the measures taken "shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations." With respect to this requirement, said Morse, "We have been acting in violation of the U.N. Charter for years." And when the United States at long last went before the Council it was "with an olive branch in one hand and bombs in the other."

FIRSTHAND EVIDENCE

But the most effective refutation of Rusk's statement that SEATO imposes on the United States "a clear and direct commitment to the security of South Vietnam against external attack" is made by persons interviewed by this correspondent who participated in the drafting of the treaty in 1954. This is a brief composite of their comments:

The reservations as to "constitutional processes" was written in at Secretary Dulles' insistence to give notice to the other signatories that the final decision as to making war was vested in Congress. He was also a great believer in collective security, and he knew that when the French pulled out of Indochina there would be a vacuum into which the Communists would flow if there was not collective action to prevent it.

All of the parties, including great Britain and France, are bound to the others to take action under the treaty. Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos are not parties, and the treaty signatories are not bound to them. They were added by protocol to the treaty area, not for their benefit but for the benefit of the signatories.

Our basic trouble in Vietnam is that we have not been proceeding under the treaty but going it alone. This is due to a complete misappraisal and underestimate of the military and political considerations involved. We thought it was a minor concern we could handle ourselves without difficulty. So we did not insist that our partners participate.

For confirmation of this background, the persons interviewed cited the report on the treaty of the Senate committee. Hours of effort to procure a copy were, however, unsuccessful.

GREAT ACT—GREAT ACTORS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, columnists have recently noted the soundness of the Employment Act of 1946. It is now generally recognized that this act has wrought a fundamental, beneficial change in the capitalistic system. It is possible to avoid depression.

I think we should pause a moment to recognize the farsighted men who put the Employment Act of 1946 on the books.

One of them was my predecessor, the late Senator James E. Murray. He was the author of the act. He guided it through committee and through Congress. The act bears no man's name but truly it should be termed, and I term it, the Murray Employment Act of 1946.

The man outside Congress who did the most to enact this historic legislation is one whose lifetime of service is being recognized this week. He is James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, who is retiring after 25 eventful years as president of that great farm organization.

Also retiring this week is his colleague and close associate, Glenn Talbott, vice president of the National Farmers Union. Glenn Talbott is the leading member of one of the most remarkable families this Nation has ever produced. He became president of the North Dakota Farmers Union after his father, who organized and headed it, was killed in an auto accident. Glenn Talbot's sister, Mrs. Gladys Talbott Edwards, was for many years the highly effective director of education of the National Farmers Union. Their nephew is now carrying on the family's proud role as an official of the North Dakota Farmers Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, immediately following these remarks, two articles concerning the Murray Employment Act of 1946, to which Senator James E. Murray, president, James G. Patton and the Talbott family contributed so much. One article, by Joseph R. Selvin of the New York Herald Tribune News Service and headlined "Boom Is Tribute to Employment Act," appeared in the February 1966 issue of the Washington Post. The other, by Walter Lippmann, headlined "The Boom," appeared in the March 15, 1966, issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Feb. 20, 1966]

BOOM IS TRIBUTE TO EMPLOYMENT ACT—1946 MEASURE MARKED POLICY TURNING POINT (By Joseph R. Selvin)

The Unemployment Act of 1946 is 20 years old today. The American economy is booming. And there is an increasingly hot debate about whether President Johnson ought to call for higher taxes to damp the fires of inflation.

The booming economy is a very real tribute to the employment act.

So, too, is the burgeoning tax debate.

The employment act established a national policy to use the power of the Federal Government to influence economic activity. The economy is booming in large measure because those powers have been used.

The deliberate, persistent use of Federal power to influence the economy is a new development. It has gained increasing acceptance since the employment act was passed but it has won general recognition only in the decade of the 1960's—during the administrations of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

MEMORIES OF 1930'S

The expectation in 1946 was that the Government would have to take steps to prevent a deep depression and to provide millions of jobs for the American people. Memories of the great depression of the 1930's were fresh in mind and the main goal

of the act's original sponsors was to see that another such calamity did not follow World War II.

The bill started out as a full employment law but a Senate-House conference committee watered down the final version and set the more modest maximum employment target. Among other things, the legislators wanted it clear that the Government was not guaranteeing a job to anyone.

As it turned out, the immediate postwar problem proved to be inflation. After that, the challenge was to offset mild recessions—with the one exception of the Korean war boom in the early 1950's. More recently the Government has been trying to move toward the twin goals of attaining noninflationary full employment at home while balancing the U.S. international payments accounts.

Four recessions have hit the United States since the end of World War II. They came in 1948-49, 1953-54, 1957-58, and 1960-61.

EISENHOWER WAS COOL

The Employment Act approach almost died a young death when Eisenhower became President in 1953. He was suspicious of economic planning, and mistrusted both the setting of goals and the use of Federal power to achieve them. Mr. Eisenhower intended to abolish the Council of Economic Advisers established by the act but decided to rebuild it under the chairmanship of Arthur Burns only after he had been in office for some months.

The historic Employment Act breakthrough came in June 1962, when Harvard man Kennedy went to Yale to accept an honorary degree and called for reducing taxes to stimulate a growing but sluggish economy.

Mr. Kennedy acted primarily at the prodding of Walter Heller, the Chairman of his Council. It marked a profound change in President Kennedy's own instinctively conservative position.

Ten months later President Kennedy made his precedent-setting decision to call for lower taxes even though the country was increasingly prosperous and even though the Government still had a large budget deficit.

The budget no longer was to be viewed as a set of books that were to be balanced in good times and that, if necessary, could be allowed to become unbalanced in poor times.

Instead, it was to be looked upon as an economic tool to achieve broader national policy goals—more jobs, higher living standards, increased production, stable prices, and the like.

The tax cut became law in the winter of 1964 after Dallas and after Lyndon Johnson had become President.

It supplied the prescribed stimulation. Economic activity rose strongly and steadily after it became law.

But the current U.S. prosperity was not entirely planned that way despite some strong administration hints to the contrary.

The theory of the tax cut was one thing. The actual execution of the plan was something quite different.

Congress voted a substantially larger cut than the administration had asked so the rapid pace of the upturn that followed was partly fortuitous.

Then, there was Vietnam. The economy is rocketing ahead a significant measure because of the very large additional stimulus the Vietnam buildup has provided since last summer.

Employment has been going up much faster than the administration expected a year ago and unemployment has been dropping much more rapidly than it anticipated.

PLANNING LESS THAN SCIENCE

All of which makes the point that economic planning as it is practiced in the mid-1960's continues to be something less than an exact science.

Now the debate is over the great and central stabilization question of whether Mr.

"free" office to have his leave examined, 10 unexpected clients will retain a private practitioner as a result of the general increase in consciousness of and confidence in the law, legality, and the availability of a defense against injustice which the legal services program will create. Private practice will grow enormously by bringing the poor into our world of the law and lawyers.

I have spoken about the contribution lawyers in general and yourselves in particular, as leaders of the organized bar, can make to provide adequate legal representation for the poor. We should agree that the poor are not now adequately represented, and that the quantity and quality of that representation should be improved. The question now is how that should be done.

The predominant method in the legal aid movement and OEO's efforts has been the creation of entities similar to law firms which will advise and represent the poor. I know that other methods are possible. But the basic concept of a law firm, with attorneys hired and paid by the firm out of its own funds is, in my judgment, preferable to any of the alternatives which have been presented.

Specifically, I think it is important to point out my concerns about the so-called English system and its variations. These are programs whereby some branch of the State or local government or some other organization certifies the indigency of a potential client, who may then consult the private attorney of his choice at the whole or partial expense of the Government.

At first glance, the English system seems attractive. With only a relatively minor change in our present system of legal representation, it would permit many more people to consult a lawyer. It would also make every lawyer in the community available to the poor, instead of just the small group which may be practicing in a firm of free lawyers. This is the so-called freedom of choice argument. And finally, the lawyers who perform the services are guaranteed payment, a virtue which needs no further explanation.

But these apparent advantages are, unfortunately more advantageous for lawyers than for the poor we are committed to assist. Indeed, for the poor, such a plan has at least one major deterrent. The contemplated certification of indigency would require them to submit themselves to another means test by the welfare authorities or their counterparts. It is a certainty that vast numbers of poor people would be too frightened or too proud to place themselves voluntarily in the gears of another bureaucracy, with the result that they simply would not participate in the program at all.

The English system is also disadvantageous for another reason that I consider even more important. It clearly can achieve no other goal than the mere resolution of controversies. The legal services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the legal aid movement have far greater ambitions.

We cannot be content with the creation of systems of rendering free legal assistance to all the people who need but cannot afford a lawyer's advice. This program must contribute to the success of the war on poverty. Our responsibility is to marshal the forces of law and the strength of lawyers to combat the causes and effect of poverty. Lawyers must uncover the legal causes of poverty, remodel the systems which generate the cycle of poverty and design new social, legal, and political tools and vehicles to move poor people from deprivation, depression, and despair to opportunity, hope, and ambition. I do not believe that an English system which parcels out the legal problems of the poor to lawyers engaged not because they have a singular dedication to assist poor people but because they are members of a bar association or a lawyer referral panel and somehow

chosen freely by the poor will ever provide the necessary concerted and thoughtful legal analysis and challenge which must occur if the OEO program will be more than a chain of legal first-aid clinics. Twenty lawyers selected by 20 poor clients on 20 different days to defend eviction notices will never have even the opportunity to learn that every eviction was retaliation for the tenant's complaint of housing code violations and so look for the test case to challenge the consequent perversion of the administration of justice. But three lawyers in a "poor man's law firm" would soon see the common thread and seek the legal remedy to prevent the continued proliferation of the same legal crises.

I also entertain the presumption that an "English plan" is more costly than the provision of free legal services by salaried attorneys. Given a fixed sum of money, I speculate that I could obtain more lawyer assistance by employing a lawyer's full time for a definite period than by dispensing the same money to numerous lawyers in specific fees for services rendered.

But I admit my concerns are speculative. We will approve a very limited number of English system applications, evaluate the costs and the results carefully and assess the comparative success of such an approach. We have several preliminary applications for this method; I doubt that we will approve all of them, and I am certain that there is little likelihood that additional applications will be approved. However, we may approve such plans in sparsely populated areas where there is no other reasonable method to provide free legal assistance for the poor.

My attitude about the English system is best described by the remark a judge once made about my argument before him: "Mr. Bamberger, I have an open mind about that point—but not necessarily an empty one."

I do not expect that we will find easily the perfect solution to the task we have undertaken. Nor do I imagine that we will answer all the criticisms of the bar and public without leaving some residue of doubt about the rights and wrongs of our specific course of action. I hope that I am not disappointed in my request for your active and enthusiastic support—and for your constructive criticism.

My principal purpose is to convince you that I offer you the opportunity to use your leadership, your wisdom, your skills, and your advocacy on behalf of the poor in the finest traditions of the bar.

MEDICAL AID TO SOUTH VIETNAMESE CIVILIANS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, almost every day some Senator's office is visited by a delegation of constituents with an ambitious—and often worthy—plan to accomplish a specific purpose.

Usually, somewhere in the presentation is a sentence that goes, "We just know this will work if only we can get."

At that point, the Senator or an aid must make a decision whether the office properly can or should help do the "getting."

A few days ago, three Michigan men were in my office with a plan to get medical aid to South Vietnamese civilians.

The plan was ambitious enough to generate a temptation to dismiss it. But as they continued spelling out problems, they followed each one with a reasonable and seemingly practicable solution.

And somewhat surprisingly, they never got to the part that starts, "And all we need from the Government is—"

They did not ask for Government funds, Government supplies or Government transportation from this country to Vietnam. They were just hopeful of getting consent.

The men were two members of the Michigan Jayces—Edward James and Douglas Lawrie, of Clawson—and an older man, Dr. Jerome J. Robb, a Pontiac, Mich., physician.

And their plan—which has been endorsed as a State project by the Michigan Jaycee executive committee—is this:

They hope to collect food, medical and sanitation supplies in this country, for use by Saigon hospitals and Jaycee mobile clinics.

Dr. Robb, who spent 6 weeks in Vietnam last year as a volunteer physician, has agreed to be the project's unpaid medical field director.

Mr. James and Mr. Lawrie, keenly aware that the military just does not have the space for civilian cargoes, have settled on a solution to that bottleneck; the project will try to buy its own plane so that the Jaycees can do their own ferrying.

They are keenly aware of the black market problems in Vietnam so they have determined to get their own warehouse, their own trucks.

Will they be able to raise the money to do all these things? I do not know and neither do they. But I am impressed by their energy.

Mr. James, a research technician, and Mr. Lawrie, an airlines sales representative, have been working on the project during spare time for months. They are hopeful that the Jaycees will adopt the idea as a national project.

As I say, I have no idea what degree of success they will meet. But even their attempt, I suppose, is a significant comment on the American temperament.

These men do see a need and do feel a desire to do something to meet that need. Meanwhile, they have pragmatically studied the difficulties and the economics. And they have developed ideas on how to deal with them.

Most of us, I think, are agreed that people-to-people contact has an unmatched value in international relations.

Dr. Robb, who is particularly concerned with the welfare of Vietnamese children, puts it this way:

This is an opportunity to provide a fertile ground for democratic ideals while affording a small measure of humanity.

Both pursuits are equally admirable.

PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS IN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I believe the President's proposed reductions in the Nation's school lunch and school milk programs are the wrong cuts in the wrong programs at the wrong time.

President Johnson's 1967 budget recommends \$101 million less for these programs than for fiscal year 1966.

The special school milk program would be cut by \$82 million, down from the \$103 million appropriated for 1966. This is an 80-percent reduction in just 1 year.

In my State, the Agriculture Department estimates Hawaii would receive

March 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5667

the acceptance of its goals by the lawyers of the country.

But perhaps the most important message of Mr. Bamberger's remarks is that the Director of the Legal Services program thinks of that program as something more than simply providing lawyers to poor people who have legal problems. Were this the only aspect of the Legal Services program, I might indeed be skeptical of its ultimate success, for simply providing legal services to those who are already embroiled in legal difficulties strikes not at the heart of the problem but at its manifestations. But Mr. Bamberger has the broadness of outlook and the acuity of mind to recognize that perhaps the most important function that the Legal Services program can perform is to develop laws and programs aimed at eliminating many of the legal problems of the poor before they arise. It is this approach—an attempt to uncover the legal causes of poverty and to "remodel the systems which generate the cycle of poverty and design new social, legal, and political tools and vehicles to move poor people from deprivation, depression, and despair to opportunity, hope, and ambition"—that distinguishes the program which Mr. Bamberger so ably pilots from other efforts that have not grasped the full significance of the problem posed by the individual who cannot afford a lawyer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. E. Clinton Bamberger, Jr.—a distinguished Marylander, a distinguished lawyer, and now a distinguished public servant—be reprinted in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY E. CLINTON BAMBERGER, JR., DIRECTOR, LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF BAR PRESIDENTS, CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 19, 1966

The poor people—one-fifth of this Nation who live the emasculating contradiction of poverty in an affluent society—do not have equal justice. The deprivation of justice for the poor weakens—and indeed even threatens—the viability of our society.

The poor do not have equal justice because they do not have lawyers. Lawyers make our laws just and unless the poor have advocates for their cause—they will not have equal justice. A massive body of our law is considered only by the executive and legislative branches of our Government—but never considered, scrutinized and interpreted by the judiciary. Legislators and administrators are not omniscient—what they do is improved when what they did is debated by lawyers and interpreted and applied by a judge whose mind has been sharpened and enlightened by advocacy.

A search for truth and justice which depends upon an adversary system gropes half blind when there is no advocate for one side of the proposition.

It is fair to judge the success of American justice—and the need for this program of legal services to the poor—by considering the administration of justice in civil courts.

We can visit countless courtrooms in which civil trials are held and observe temperate and intelligent judges listening to competent counsel defend the interests of affluent clients. But what would we see if we visited a small claims court, with jurisdiction lim-

ited to several hundred dollars that serves primarily as a collection agency for retail merchants and installment credit vendors? Or a domestic relations court, where a stream of women on the public assistance rolls come to swear out contempt citations against the husbands or boyfriends who left them penniless and pregnant? Or a landlord and tenant court inundated by petitions for evictions of impoverished tenants of marginal housing?

The court's day passes in a tedious litany of names, each followed by the single word "judgment" droned out by the landlord's or merchant's attorneys. Evictions issue unchallenged, writs of repossession are signed in bundles and default judgments are the course of the day. The poor are not represented. Judgments are rarely denied, and as the clerk docketes the judgment or issues the writ of garnishment, repossession or eviction another loss is tallied on the score of a man or woman who probably has an inadequate education; a menial, degrading and irregular job, a broken marriage and a brood of illegitimate children.

Many of you know that I could extend indefinitely the catalog of disability suffered by the poor in our judicial system. They sign installment contracts with unscrupulous merchants, they go on relief and spend their lives hiding from arbitrary administration of welfare regulations; and they live in rat-infested, often-unheated slums without ever knowing that the law requires landlords to provide them with heat in the winter. They are too ignorant and too intimidated to be able to obtain their legal rights—without the advice and advocacy of lawyers.

But I have not come here merely to tell you once again that justice for the poor man in America has not succeeded, or to join you in a vague and general clucking about what we all agree is a most unfortunate situation.

Instead, I have come here to speak to you about a vastly more difficult question: the question of what you, as members and leaders of the organized bar, can, should, and I hope will do to assure equal justice for the poor. I have come here not merely to obtain your tolerance of the Office of Economic Opportunity's program to provide legal services to the poor, but to persuade you that you should lead the revolution that will bring America's poor out of their bondage and into the promised land of full equality before the law. I proffer to you the opportunity to serve as the leaders and lawgivers of a revolution conducted for the benefit of people who are poor, inarticulate, unsophisticated—and who do not have advocates.

Some may think it curious to consider lawyers as leaders of a revolution. Yet, no role could be more true to the traditions of our profession. Since the days when all land in England was owned by the king, and lawyers devised ways to make property alienable, lawyers have led the struggle to destroy archaic forms and to free their clients from the mortmain of the past. In our own country, lawyers developed the corporate forms of business enterprise that have given American business freedom to grow according to the laws of economics. In our own time, I need only point to the brilliant work of lawyers during the era of the New Deal and the lawyers in the civil rights movement during the past decade to demonstrate what a crucial role effective representation and advocacy can play in changing the posture of our Nation.

It is and has been for centuries the task of lawyers to change the status quo. In every case that turns on the law rather than the facts, a lawyer is attempting to persuade a court that the law should not be interpreted as it has been in the past, but should be given a new interpretation.

It is fallacious to thing of lawyers as guardians of tradition—rather we are the guardians and watchdogs of orderly change.

It is perhaps the greatest genius of the Anglo-American system that we have always, except when confronted with the terrible agony of the Civil War, been able to change the deepest and most fundamental characteristics of our society peacefully, with a stability of government and laws that is the awe and envy of other nations.

Today, we are asked once again to follow brilliant tradition. Lawyers are exhorted to guide, control, and direct a change in our society. I ask you to put your traditions and skills to work, not for the benefit of the corporations, not for the benefit of the Federal Government, but for the benefit of the poor. I ask you to lead the struggle to provide economically underprivileged Americans with a full and fair participation in American justice. Specifically, I have come to ask you to work actively in your communities to establish and support programs to provide free legal assistance for people who are poor and cannot employ an attorney. I ask you to challenge the critics who attempt to undermine our effort without knowledge of its goals or character.

It might be helpful if I dealt briefly with what seems to be a common concern of some lawyers who have expressed at least skepticism, if not opposition, toward the legal services program. That concern might best be expressed as the fear that we will so thoroughly accomplish our task of providing legal services to the poor that attorneys who now draw some or all of their practice from people with lower or lower middle incomes will find themselves without clients.

This concern stems from a basic lack of understanding about poor people and their communities. It presumes that there is a static quantity of legal work that needs to be done in a given community of poor people, that that work is now being done by attorneys, and that at the introduction of free legal services, the clients of those attorneys will immediately take their business to the free office. These presumptions are not correct.

First, there is not a fixed amount of legal work in a given community. Poor people are constantly confronted by problems that we as attorneys would immediately recognize as legal, but which they, without education or the custom of consulting a lawyer, never realize might be solved by advocacy or representation. If the poor had the habit of talking to a lawyer, if there was, in the community of the poor, the consciousness of the need for and utility of lawyers, I submit that the volume of problems about which lawyers would be consulted would rise from a trickle to a flood. As evidence of this fact, in 1965, the first year in which the neighborhood law offices were established in Washington, they handled about 5,000 inquiries, and the Legal Aid Society at the same time reported the greatest annual volume of cases in its history of 50 years.

Second, it is not true that the legal work of the poor is now being handled by attorneys. How many poor people, for example, hire an attorney to avail themselves of the rights that they have in many jurisdictions to a jury trial on a complaint for eviction for nonpayment of rent? Lawyers are not doing this work now, nor are they giving advice to people who come into conflict with welfare authorities, nor are they advising the many ignorant people who are tempted into signing unfair installment contracts. And there are merely three of the literally hundreds of ways in which lawyers might but are not now representing the poor.

Finally, I do not believe that either the present or the potential clients of attorneys in poor neighborhoods will leave their attorneys in any significant number to enjoy free legal services. Not only is the lawyer-client relationship a highly personal one, but once the legal services program is functioning well, for every client who comes into the

nature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 432. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3584. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines;

H.R. 8030. An act to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12752. An act to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

FURTHER AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961, AS AMENDED—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (To accompany H.R. 12169)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12169) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
B. B. HICKENLOOPER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
EDNA F. KELLY,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
FRANCES P. BOLTON,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have received many inquiries as to whether there would be a yea-and-nay vote. Let me say that I have no intention to ask for one.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote. I wish to speak for 10 minutes to make a record against the conference report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not intend to ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the conference report. I wish the RECORD to show a summary of my position. Let me point out to the Senate that the conference report calls for an expenditure of \$415 million by way of a supplemental authorization—\$275 million to go to Vietnam; \$7.5 million to go to Laos; \$7.5 million to go to Thailand; \$25 million to go to the Dominican Republic; and \$100 million for the President's contingency fund.

Mr. President, concerning the \$275 million for Vietnam, it is my view that at least half of it will get into the hands of the Vietcong, one way or the other, or be destroyed by them. I cannot imagine how the Senate could vote to waste this much of the American taxpayers' money until we get that war settled.

There is a certain amount of aid that we can provide while the war is going on, but we cannot provide the kind of massive aid which the President is talking about while the war is going on.

In my judgment, if the Senate votes for this conference report, it will be voting to throw away large sums of American taxpayers' money into an area in which it cannot possibly do any good.

Furthermore, let me say that under this administration, a great deal of this money will be used by one of the most corrupt regimes in Vietnam we can imagine. I am satisfied that much of this money will go straight into graft and corruption under the Ky administration in Vietnam.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the committee report on the bill, and let it speak for itself. I am at a loss to understand how the committee could bring this report to the floor of the Senate and then recommend the authorization and appropriation.

The report states, in part:

Foreign aid should not remain sacrosanct when it comes to apportioning the war's financial costs among Federal activities. Belt tightening because of the war must not be restricted to domestic programs but should include our foreign aid programs as well. American citizens should not be called upon to accept reductions in programs which affect their daily lives, see their taxes increased and war costs spiral, while the foreign aid program escapes unaffected and undiminished. A reduction in the aid program will be of help in funding domestic programs proposed to be cut back in fiscal 1967.

The fiscal 1967 appropriations request for economic assistance is \$2.469 billion compared with a total appropriation for this fiscal year of \$2.468 billion, including the funds authorized by this bill. It appears that programs in other countries have not been reduced to compensate for the increased program in Vietnam. The committee expects that the reduction in the total program will take into account the additional assistance provided here for Vietnam and that the executive branch's presentation to the committee will be in keeping with this intent.

The committee in asking that budget presentation reflect an appropriate reduction in the proposed program for the next fiscal year does not wish to imply that further economies are not needed in the program for fiscal 1966.

Mr. President, let me warn the Senate tonight that the administration does not intend to reduce foreign aid by one single dollar, that the administration intends

to continue foreign aid—yes, even on an increased basis.

What did I try to do in committee, as many Senators now in the Chamber know? I tried to get some commitment or assurance that we would cut back on foreign aid elsewhere in the world while we pour these hundreds of millions of dollars into southeast Asia. All I got from the committee was language, but not votes.

In my judgment, the committee cannot justify bringing this bill to the floor of the Senate, without first assuring the taxpayers of the country that we are reducing at least an equal amount of foreign aid elsewhere in the world.

Who is responsible for it?

The President of the United States.

What is he up to?

He is up to cutting domestic programs—the so-called Great Society programs—by millions of dollars.

I urge the American taxpayers to hold the President to an accounting for this course of action. The American taxpayers are entitled to have appropriations for domestic programs go forward until there is first a drastic cut in the budget for foreign aid.

This is the time to start.

I am going to vote against the conference report. The Committee on Foreign Relations would not make the start. It gives us only language in the bill, approving the principle of what I assert, but it will not give us a bill which puts that principle into effect.

Listen to what the committee states in the majority:

The committee is concerned about recent news reports of widespread corruption in Vietnam involving our aid.

So we proceed to give them \$275 million more. Continuing reading:

It is hoped that the program is being policed adequately all the way up and down the line by our officials. Recently the General Accounting Office announced that it will revitalize its investigative activities concerning the AID program in Vietnam and conduct on-the-scene audits.

Mr. President, one of the reasons I am going to vote against this conference report is that I am satisfied the Ky administration is thoroughly corrupt, that we are pouring money into a corrupt administration which we are supporting and which happens to be our puppet administration in South Vietnam.

I say we ought to wait until we settle the war and then provide what is necessary—and I am for it—so we can properly plant the economic seedbed in Vietnam, which would be the best guarantee to check communism in that part of the world. The evidence shows that the Ky government is engaged in corruption. Too much of this aid will get into the hands of the Vietcong. Too much will be captured by the Vietcong. Too many of the economic improvements will be destroyed by the Vietcong.

I think that providing this money is putting the cart before the horse. I do not think we can justify wasting the money of the American people in this way.

I turn now to the Dominican Republic. Twenty-five million dollars is provided

March 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5713

On that basis, I think this is bad legislation, and I hope the motion to recommit will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 51, as follows:

[No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Aiken	Dirksen	Mundt
Allott	Dominick	Prouty
Bennett	Fannin	Saltonstall
Boggs	Fong	Simpson
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Smith
Case	Hruska	Tower
Cooper	Javits	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Morton	

NAYS—51

Bartlett	Inouye	Nelson
Bible	Jackson	Neuberger
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Long, La.	Pell
Cannon	Magnuson	Proxmire
Church	Mansfield	Randolph
Clark	McCarthy	Ribicoff
Dodd	McClellan	Robertson
Douglas	McGovern	Russell, S.C.
Ellender	McIntyre	Russell, Ga.
Ervin	Metcalfe	Sparkman
Fulbright	Mondale	Stennis
Harris	Monroney	Symington
Hart	Montoya	Talmadge
Hartke	Morse	Tydings
Hill	Moss	Yarborough
Holland	Muskie	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Hayden	McNamara
Bass	Jordan, N.C.	Murphy
Bayh	Jordan, Idaho	Pearson
Brewster	Kennedy, N.Y.	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Kuchel	Smathers
Eastland	Lausche	Thurmond
Gore	Long, Mo.	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	McGee	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the bill, as amended.

The committee amendment, in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Russell of South Carolina in the chair). The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 2499) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] today has won the Senate's high respect for his successful handling of this measure which permits SBA loan participation by the public. We congratulate him for a well-deserved achievement.

His strong advocacy was joined by broad understanding and sincere views which could not have been better articulated. Such a combination assured successful action.

Further commendation is due the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. Their constructive assistance is always greatly appreciated.

Also, we appreciate the cooperation generously extended by both the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. In urging their own strong and sincere fiscal views on this proposal, these distinguished Senators joined nevertheless to obtain the Senate's efficient and orderly action. And for that we are always grateful. The same may be said for the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and, of course, for the highly capable ranking minority member of the Select Committee on Small Business the distinguished senior Massachusetts Senator [Mr. SALTONSTALL] whose cooperative efforts are always exemplary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Hon. CARL ALBERT, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, had been elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature.

March 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5715

to give support to more American wrongdoing in the Dominican Republic. If it were not for the fact that so much of our attention has been directed to Vietnam, and the American people knew what was going on in the Dominican Republic, there would be a hue and cry against it.

Twenty-five million dollars from the United States. What is the matter with our allies in Vietnam? Why is not the Organization of American States willing to put some money toward this \$25 million?

I offered an amendment in committee that would have cut \$12.5 million from the funds for the Dominican Republic. As I recall, it received three votes.

In my judgment, the expenditure of an additional \$25 million in the Dominican Republic cannot be justified. It will greatly change our image in Latin America. Again we are being charged with intervention, and rightly charged, because we are guilty of intervention in the Dominican Republic. We cannot possibly justify our action in the Dominican Republic. I want that dispute put into the hands of the Organization of American States, just as I want the war in Vietnam to be put into the hands of the United Nations and have that organization lay down a commitment for a cease-fire and enforce it against the United States and North Vietnam and the other combatants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I take the position that it is time for us to start saving the American taxpayers the millions and millions of dollars that are going to be wasted in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic, and elsewhere through this authorization bill.

I am sorry to find myself in such disagreement with the Foreign Relations Committee, but when the committee sets forth language that sustains the principles I have been supporting for some time now, without doing a specific thing to start this economy, I find myself standing against the committee. I want this record for future reference so that the American people can know why they are being fleeced of millions of dollars being spent for unwise purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The only difference between the Senate and the House on the aid supplemental was over the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] relating to policies governing AID-financed procurement of iron and steel products for use in Vietnam.

As I stated when the amendment was being considered in the Senate last week, the Committee on Foreign Relations did not have occasion to go into this subject during its work on the supplemental authorization bill. The officials of the Agency for International Development have assured the Senate conferees that new procurement procedures, now being implemented on a trial basis, should be a considerable improvement over the earlier policy, particularly in their effect on the balance of payments.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a memorandum explaining the background of the AID policies concerning this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has always taken a strong interest in AID procurement policies and I can assure the Senate that the subject of the Senator from Indiana's amendment will be considered thoroughly by the committee during its work on the regular AID bill. On behalf of the committee, I wish to express my thanks to the Senator for focusing attention on this problem.

In view of the need for more detailed study of this matter, the Senate conferees agreed to recede with the understanding that the problem will be gone into further during the hearings on the 1967 AID program. The House conferees have also agreed to the need for the Foreign Affairs Committee to study the matter and have pledged that this will be done during their work on the regular program for the next fiscal year.

There was no disagreement as to the importance of taking whatever action might be required to insure that AID procurement policies serve the national interest as effectively as possible.

EXHIBIT 1

AID PROCUREMENT POLICY ON GALVANIZED SHEET AND PIPE FOR VIETNAM COMMERCIAL IMPORT PROGRAM

AID has recently instituted a new set of rules to permit the continued, quick importation of galvanized steel sheets from Korea and other less developed Asian countries (not Japan) into Vietnam, without feeding inflation in Vietnam, and without adversely affecting the U.S. balance of payments or the U.S. steel industry.

Under the new galvanized sheet procurement procedure, the Koreans, Chinese, Filipinos, Malaysians, and Thais will be paid by a special letter of credit restricted not only to U.S. source, but to certain AID codes for iron and steel products and tools with high iron and steel content, plus limited amounts of U.S. scrap. Purchases of scrap are limited, however, to half of the tonnage of Japanese black plate, approximately the amount of scrap required to be used in its manufacture. The restricted special letters of credit will provide new iron and steel business for the United States, which, in the first 10 months of 1965 (latest figures available), for example, supplied only \$1.3 million, or 5 percent of Korea's purchases in these categories. (Japan had 79 percent, Western Europe 16 percent.) This new business for U.S. industry should more than offset losses in sales of galvanized sheet. In return, the Asian countries again may utilize Japanese black plate in their manufacturing process.

The background of the new procedure is as follows:

Prior to July 1963, AID policy allowed the developing countries to participate in supplying selected commodities under AID-financed programs without regard to their source or origin. Not only did this usually result in lower costs to AID and to the foreign consumer but it also enhanced foreign exchange earnings by countries receiving U.S. grant aid. During this period, Korea and Taiwan imported Japanese black plate, galvanized the black plate and sold it to Vietnamese importers under the AID-financed commercial import program, result-

ing in a substantial flow of AID dollars indirectly to Japan.

In July 1963 AID adopted a new procurement policy in order to lessen adverse effects on the U.S. balance of payments. This regulation required that the item procured must come from an eligible source, and limited to 30 percent of the f.o.b. sales price the components of the item which could originate in advanced foreign countries such as Japan. Under this regulation, Korea and Taiwan continued to import and galvanize Japanese black plate for sale to Vietnamese importers under AID financing. The Korean and Taiwanese suppliers contended that less than 30 percent of the components by value, as measured against their final sales price, came from an ineligible source (Japan), particularly since the Japanese black plate was made in large part from U.S. scrap. The dollars earned were free foreign exchange to be expended wherever in the free world Korea and Taiwan chose.

In January 1964 AID modified the 70-30 componentry ratio to 90-10. This made it extremely difficult for the underdeveloped countries to continue their trade in galvanized steel products. As a result, Taiwan terminated export sales to Vietnam in August 1965. Korea continued to import and galvanize Japanese black plate for export to Vietnam, justifying its actions by importing U.S. scrap for delivery to bonded warehouses in Japan for the purpose of making black plate to be shipped to Korea for further processing. AID found it increasingly difficult to police and enforce the 90-10 componentry ratio in connection with these Korean exports of galvanized steel plate and sheets to Vietnam. Therefore, AID suspended shipments of galvanized products under AID financing from Korea to Vietnam. This action seriously troubled the Korean Government which had just sent large contingents of Korean troops to fight in Vietnam and was considering further troop contributions, and deprived Vietnam of a nearby, low-price source of an urgently needed commodity.

After detailed careful investigations, AID developed and instituted the new procurement procedure.

It is estimated that procurement of galvanized steel products directly from the United States would cost at least \$30 to \$40 a ton more than from the Asian countries under the new galvanized sheet procurement procedure. An alternative would be to require that the Asian countries utilize U.S. black plate in their manufacturing process. However, it is estimated that this would increase the cost of the delivered products by at least \$60 a ton. Either increase would have considerable inflationary effect in Vietnam, which will import at least \$20 million of these commodities this year under the commercial import program.

Countries other than Korea were included as eligible sources under the new procedure in part to insure competition to prevent possible Korean profiteering. Each of the included countries is supporting in various ways U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

AID believes that the new procedure provides quick, nearby sources of galvanized roofing and pipe urgently needed for Vietnam at a reasonable price, also serving U.S. foreign policy interests, all without damaging either the U.S. balance of payments or the U.S. steel industry.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

"HOW EFFECTIVE CAN DEMOCRACY BE?" SPEECH BY GEORGE E. AGREE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE CONGRESS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by George E. Agree, executive director of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, on the subject "How Effective Can Democracy Be?"

I found it to be such a searching analysis on the subject of democracy that I believe it is deserving of the consideration of all Members of this body, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Speech of George E. Agree, executive director, National Committee for an Effective Congress, at American-German Cultural Center and Library, New York City, March 2, 1966)

HOW EFFECTIVE CAN DEMOCRACY BE?

When I was a boy, my father took me to hear a lecture by Mr. Seger. And it is a great pleasure and honor to share a platform with him now. My distinguished associate in our discussion this evening was then recently arrived in America as a kind of latter-day Paul Revere to spread the alarm that the Nazis were coming.

In the 30 years since that lecture, there have been many changes. Instead of the Nazis coming here, Democrats and Republicans went to Germany. Our western corner of the world is much improved; and I believe that on balance the whole world is in better shape.

But 30 years is a very short time. The cost has been high, and the achievement is precarious. No one who has lived through this time, or who can look ahead to the widening impact of the population, technological, and other explosions of our age, can be overly sanguine about our prospects.

Nevertheless, I believe there is good reason for optimism.

Men of our general appearance and capacity have had a rather long existence on this earth, but only a very short history. What we call civilization—those new activities which began when men for the first time saw themselves, however dimly, as shapers rather than mere clay—is a phenomenon of only the last 8,000 or 10,000 years; that is, of only the most recent 2 percent of homo sapiens' 500,000 years' existence.

But this vision of ourselves spread very rapidly from the middle eastern river valleys in which it first appeared—and today, but for a few isolated remnants of the Stone Age, it is shared to some degree by all mankind.

And the vision has its consequences. Five hundred years ago, men did not even know the shape of our planet. Now we can circle it in 90 minutes and are preparing to land on others. Five hundred years ago, representative government was virtually unknown on this earth. Now more people govern themselves through representative institutions than were alive in the entire world as recently as the time of the Declaration of Independence.

I believe it was natural and inevitable that advances in man's ability to respond to and control his environment should have been accompanied by this growth of representative government—and this form of government should have taken firmest root in precisely those areas where most of the advances occurred.

For there is a fundamental and organic relationship between progress and freedom. Wide-ranging curiosity, the initiative to experiment, the enterprise to change can only flourish among men who are free. And, as even the Russians are beginning to learn, the complexity and interdependence of the new world we are creating impose great and, in the long run, insupportable difficulties on governments whose decisionmaking institutions are not responsive to all information and sensitive to all interests in a society.

The answer to our question here tonight is that political democracy, whatever its faults or weaknesses, is the best form of government yet devised for assuring this responsiveness and sensitivity—and that in technologically advanced countries all other forms of government ultimately prove too inefficient and costly, in both economic and social terms.

What are the distinguishing characteristics of a democracy?

Two are essential, it seems to me.

The first, as I have already suggested, is that people have a certain view of themselves in relation to the world. This view is not automatic in man: it has to be learned. But it is implicit in the human condition, and men are learning it.

In the United States, the political expression of this view was bred out of centuries of prior Anglo-Saxon development, reinforced by a natural frontier skepticism of authority.

In some other countries, its political expression is bred out of bitter and painful experience with the inadequacies and dangers of other systems.

The other essential characteristic of democracy is a representative structure based on election of the Government's principal officers. This structure must be suited to the attitudes and comprehension of the people; and it must operate with a fair degree of sensitivity and efficiency.

The American representative structure is distinguished from the characteristic European structure principally in that it did not grow out of and is not conducive to a party system. The authors of our Constitution were antiparty; and the Constitution was in fact designed in the hope that it would avoid the development of parties.

All Representatives, all Senators, and the President, himself—as well as their counterparts at the State level—are individually elected by direct popular vote in geographically defined constituencies. They act with primary reference to their own constituencies, and their fortunes are largely independent of each other. The result is that effective consideration and decision of public questions occurs almost exclusively within the Government, rather than the parties, and is conducted almost exclusively by elected officials or their agents.

The authors of the system conceived of an inherently neutral process of arriving at exigent decisions, rather than one expressing, or mediating between, ideologies. The result has been a substantial bulwark against the development of ideologies; and the parties that have developed despite their intention are still essentially nonideological.

Under a parliamentary system, there is incentive for even small ideological groups to form parties of their own, because they may hope to elect a few members of the legislature and that these, in turn, may participate in the coalitions that form the government. Here, there is no such incentive. Any faction hoping to have leverage upon the President must affiliate with one of the two major parties.

Accordingly, our parties exist primarily, and almost exclusively, for the limited purpose of conducting and winning elections. They have almost no role in the policy or operating levels of government. Indeed, it would be almost inconceivable for even the

national chairmen of either of our parties to take any part in the formulation of administration or congressional policy.

How is the system working now? Again, I believe encouragingly well.

Ours is a very open form of government, and there is much access at many levels to the centers of decision. Furthermore, most economic, social, ideological, and other interests have developed effective instruments and techniques for utilizing this access.

Though here, as elsewhere, the executive power has grown greatly in relation to the legislative, the cockpit for most of our contention on public issues remains the Congress. It is an institution with many faults—a few of which it may be in the process of correcting; but, on the whole, it continues to perform its essential function. There is hardly ever an interest or point of view which does not receive some expression in its Halls.

It is often forgotten that much of the New Frontier and Great Society program was actually developed by Democrats in Congress during the period of Republican administration in the fifties. Certainly, the final shape of even Presidential prospects is greatly determined in the House and Senate.

In addition to its role in determining policy, the Congress—as it has vividly demonstrated in recent weeks—has an enormous power of public education, independent of Executive will. Whether or not this is used wisely or responsibly, and often it is not, that power remains one of the most constructive features of our government and one of our greatest safeguards against executive encroachment upon the democratic process.

Looking ahead, we always will have the problem of those who may be impatient with the system, who may feel at any given time that it is not producing enough of what they may happen to want.

In recent years, the principal theoretical critics of the system have been in the liberal community—and particularly in its academic wing. There are some political scientists who believe our parties should be greatly strengthened as a means of compelling greater congressional responsiveness to the President. They deplore what they consider our chaos, and admire the order in parliamentary systems.

They are, for example, among the principal proponents of a 4-year term for Representatives concurrent with that of the President—because it would contribute to the discipline they believe is required.

But to make the legislature more responsive to the Executive, without making the Executive as responsible to the legislature as it is in parliamentary systems, would not emulate those systems so much as it would prepare the ground for a kind of American authoritarianism.

The principal growth of this school of thought among political scientists occurred during the 20 years following the 1938 election, when the House of Representatives was dominated by what has been called the "conservative coalition." Based on rural and southern constituencies, where there was either a declining population or a disenfranchised population, the coalition, and representative of the American people as was the President. This was contrary to constitutional theory; but it did accord with the facts to some degree.

Nevertheless, if the problem was that the House was unrepresentative, the proper solution was to make it more representative—not to put it under Presidential influence. This is now happening—thanks to history, the courts and the Congress itself. The urbanization of our people, reapportionment, and the extension of the franchise are together producing a profound shift in the electoral base of the House—making it more representative and much closer to that of the

March 15, 1966

Lieutenant Noble said he expects to leave Vietnam sometime this June and return home early in July.

The Massepequan added:
"It is really too bad that there are people at home who censure our action as well as our presence in Vietnam without really understanding the situation here. These people do not discourage the men serving here in that they represent a tiny faction of the U.S. population, whereas the majority of the people are behind us."

The young man was one of Massepequa high school's stars in football and lacrosse. A 1959 graduate of Massepequa high school, Noble graduated from Cortland State Teachers College in 1963.

Noble's father is the physical education director of school district 23.

MR. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
LEJ Ranch, Texas.

DEAR SIR: My husband is in Vietnam. He is there by choice. He has been in the military service for a little over 8 years. He is a soldier. He believes that fighting is his job, and in Vietnam he is doing his job. He feels that it is not only his duty, but he also feels and knows that if we don't stop the Communists in Vietnam, we will have them here in the States and even in our own private homes.

My husband said that he wants to fight in Vietnam, now, so that our son will not have to grow up in a communistic country.

My husband is fighting now so that, maybe, our son will not have to fight in any war when he grows up. My husband and I do not understand why so many of these teenagers are against the war in Vietnam. Is it that they are against war itself or is it because they don't want to get involved in something that is dangerous? Or, is it because they are scared? Don't they know that it is just as dangerous to breathe or walk down a street? Or, to do anything? Don't they know that they can die easier walking across a street than dying in a war?

You are probably wondering, by now, where I get off cutting down the poor misguided teens of today. Well, when I was married, I was only 17. I have a 15-month-old son. I lost a baby in June of 1965—I am at present pregnant. My husband is only 25 years old. If he dies in Vietnam, I will be a widow at either 19 or 20. I am at present 19 years of age. I have learned to live with the fact that I may have to raise my children by myself.

You see, my husband and I neither one believe in divorce or remarriage. You see, our love is so complete that there is no room for another man or woman. As Jimmy, my husband said, what would he do with two wives or I with two husbands, in the life that awaits us after death on this earth?

I feel strongly about my husband fighting in Vietnam. I agree with him 100 percent. I understand and agree with his reasons for him being in Vietnam.

I wish the teens of today would stop and think. Maybe, if they did, they would understand our cause in Vietnam. Maybe, then, they will come to understand why my husband and many more husbands, sons, and boyfriends are fighting in that far-off land.

They are fighting to keep freedom for themselves and their children and their children's children. Maybe someday, the teens of today will understand what freedom really means. Freedom is so sorely taken for granted. Maybe, if they lost their freedom, they would know and understand the reason our young men are fighting in Vietnam.

Maybe, someday, the teens of today will understand. I only hope they find out before it's too late.

Sincerely,

MARGUERITE WORSTELL.

South Dakota State Legislature Concurrent Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, along with other members of the South Dakota congressional delegation, we have introduced legislation authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Oahe unit, Missouri River Basin project, in South Dakota. In this connection I would like to call to the attention of the members of the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs particularly, and the Congress, the resolution adopted by the South Dakota State Legislature in support of the project.

The resolution is as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

Concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress to promptly review and approve authorizing legislation for the construction of the Oahe unit, an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

Whereas the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887) as supplemented and extended by the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 641) authorized a general comprehensive plan for the conservation, control, and use of the water resources of the Missouri River Basin; and

Whereas the Oahe unit is an integral part of the Missouri River Basin project, which following exhaustive studies and investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation has been found to be engineeringly feasible and economically justified as evidenced by that agency's report titled "Oahe Unit, James Diversion—South Dakota, Missouri River Basin Project," dated May 1965 which was subsequently approved by the Secretary of the Interior on October 6, 1965; and

Whereas residents of South Dakota have for many years counted on new irrigation development possible through the construction of the Oahe unit to justify the large sacrifice of 509,000 acres of productive lands given up for the storage of water behind the four main-stem reservoirs constructed with the State; and

Whereas the development of the Oahe unit will further result in increased and stabilized agricultural production from lands which are presently under production, which in turn will result in many benefits to the State of South Dakota, the region, and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the 41st Legislative Assembly of the State of South Dakota sincerely and respectfully petitions and urges the Congress of the United States to promptly consider and take favorable action authorizing the construction of the Oahe unit; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, the members of the Missouri River Basin States' congressional delegations,

the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Adopted by the senate January 11, 1966.

Concurred in by the house of representatives February 2, 1966.

CHARLES DROZ,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

PAUL IMMAN,
Chief Clerk.

LEM OVERPECK,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

The Real Issue in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Frank A. White is one of Indiana's best known and best loved journalists. His famous column "The Hoosier Day" appears regularly in newspapers all over the State and I have long enjoyed his friendship.

In the March 4, 1966, Martinsville, Ind., Reporter, "The Hoosier Day" states a simple and unequivocal truth that has all too often been totally ignored or flatly denied in the debate on our role in Vietnam. The United States, as Mr. White makes clear, is in Vietnam as a devotion to principle; we seek neither gain nor profit, and charges of aggression leveled against the United States are totally wrong. I commend his remarks to all, and especially to some Americans who seem to feel the United States is always wrong and those who oppose us are always right.

[From the Martinsville (Ind.) Reporter, Mar. 4, 1966]

THE HOOSIER DAY
(By Frank A. White)

So many mean things have been said abroad and in the United States about our being in the Vietnam war, when will someone say the truth.

Our presence in Vietnam is one of the greatest examples of unselfish philanthropy and devotion to principle the world has witnessed. We seek not one square foot of territorial gain, not one dollar of material profit.

American boys, cream of the crop, are spilling rich red blood in jungles of Vietnam not alone to help education, health, and economic growth of a small nation.

They die fighting for a principle of small nations remaining free of Communist takeover and to have self-determination.

The Louis Harris public opinion poll, national, shows that doves, hawks, owls, and chickens differ as to war methods. But public opinion remains two to one that we have a job to do in Vietnam and should stay. Our fighting men there write to me, "we have a job to finish—we belong here."

Will we surrender the vast land and population mass of Asia to Red atheism? To do so might be the determining factor in a world enslaved by communism.

Congressman RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH who knows war firsthand, put it well. He said: "Stakes in southeast Asia are enormous. We

A1446

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 15, 1966

must consider what would happen if we pulled out of that war-racked area.

"First, Malaysia would undoubtedly fall to the Communists, perhaps overnight. This would mean that Red China would dominate the Straits of Malacca, where more than 12,000 ships a year pass. Closing these straits would be fatal to Japan, India, and the Philippines.

"Burma would then be a sitting duck for Mao's armies, and Indonesian dictator Sukarno could control the communications lines between the Philippines and Australia. Thailand, already advertised by the Communists as a takeover target, would be next in line. These are established facts and are known to the free world. Most of the free nations are not helping us. Many are actually giving aid and comfort to our enemies by permitting their ships to transport cargo to the Communists in North Vietnam."

We have many denominations and religious sects. The underlying principle of all is that those who are strong must come to the aid of his brethren, regardless of race or nationality.

The war that is waged in Vietnam at this hour will determine whether the 16 million people of that country will be freemen or forever be enslaved by atheistic communism. How can churchmen look the other way and be silent in this crisis?

How can leaders of great church organizations assume the role of military experts to tie the hands of our President and those charged with decision in the winning of the war of freedom and self-determination?

What about the bitter and endless charges of cruelty against American soldiers? Much has been made of an American soldier shooting before television a Vietcong woman. The camera did not show she was reaching for a machinegun and it was life or death for the American and his buddies. Much has been said of destroying Vietcong crops and the accidental killing of a baby in a tunnel by a grenade.

How little has been printed or shown of Vietcong atrocities. Have we shown the fact that the Vietcong took a 14-year-old refugee, had him stand on a rock and beat his feet to a pulp with gun butts. They then said, "Now run to freedom." Has anything been said of driving 110 tacks in a ring about a refugee's skull and the Vietcong saying "here is your crown of thorns." Or have we been shown the Vietcong driving chop sticks in a refugee's ears, saying "now listen to the priest read the Bible."

There are 700,000 half-starved refugees in South Vietnam while we have a problem of surpluses of food.

How can anyone be blind to the lessons of history as it relates to Communist domination?

A Patriotic Gesture**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I received a letter from the wife of a young man who had been drafted. Because of the short notice he received from his draft board, the young man was unable to give his landlord the 30-day notice required by his lease. Therefore, the landlord at first decided to hold the security deposit.

However, when I wrote to the company which owned the apartment house explaining the circumstances, I immediately received a check for the deposit by return mail, and I have sent it to the draftee's wife.

The owner of the apartment is Yorkview Corp. Since landlords are often considered hardhearted, I am pleased to disclose this fine gesture and commend the officers of the Yorkview Corp., and especially its president, Alfred Sanzari.

Timely Message**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, along with many other papers, the Philadelphia Inquirer has warm words for President Johnson's special message on crime.

The paper believes one of his most important recommendations is the creation of a high-level commission to revise Federal criminal laws—and also important, it says, is his urging of States to follow suit in their jurisdiction.

Because others may peruse the editorial with benefit, I herewith am making a copy available for printing in the RECORD.

THE SPECIAL MESSAGE ON CRIME

Perhaps the most important of the recommendations made by President Johnson in his special message to Congress on crime is the creation of a high-level commission to revise Federal criminal laws—and his urging of States to follow suit in their jurisdiction is no less so.

It requires no lawyer to confirm that our varied legal entities are constantly embroiled in a "crazy quilt" patchwork of statutes, as the President noted—and if they could be reorganized and made less confusing and self-contradictory (and less full of loopholes) by 1968, as he has asked, the Nation would be far better off in its unending struggle with spreading criminality.

Mr. Johnson's suggestions for bail reform, for heightened educational effort for and on the part of law enforcement officials at all levels, for narcotics control and for the finding of jobs for "good risk" ex-convicts also seem reasonable.

There was, of course a special poignancy in his attack on the too-easy procurement of mail-order guns. His predecessor in office fell victim to one of these, in the hands of an irresponsible, muddled assassin who had had to produce no credentials to obtain the gun. Federal action in this arena has clearly been warranted for years—even before John Kennedy was murdered—and it is to be hoped that Congress will daily on this no longer.

But there is one aspect of the war on crime to which the President made little reference: pat-on-the-wrist justice. We may develop the best national and local law enforcement agencies in the world, and the most clear-sighted law codes, but they will only be frustrated if the men on the bench cannot bring themselves to administer the prescribed penalties with full vigor.

The thug who walks through courts like revolving doors will not be impressed or re-

pressed by either codes or cops so long as he can consistently "beat the rap" and knows it.

We believe Mr. Johnson's program deserves serious attention and considerable congressional support; it should, however, be accompanied by a substantial measure of judicial reform to be effective.

Centerville Iowegian Comments on 4-Year Terms for Congressmen**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, I testified before the House Committee on the Judiciary and placed myself on record as opposed to the proposal to extend the terms of Congressmen to 4 years.

My personal feeling is that the House of Representatives should remain as close as possible to the people, and that 2-year terms for its Members are necessary to retain this democratic tradition.

On this point, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members an editorial from the January 21, 1966, issue of the Centerville Iowegian of Centerville, Iowa.

The editorial correctly points out that government today is a complex process, often hard for the average citizen to understand, and adds:

But by bringing all the Members of the House of Representatives to an accounting each 2 years, most certainly this wing of Government is going to stay pretty well attuned to the people.

This, I think, is the strongest argument for retaining the 2-year terms for Congressmen. As I said in my statement to the Committee on the Judiciary, I believe we should continue to honor the Jeffersonian principle of frequent elections.

I might add that I do not agree with the editorial's contention that a "snap of the Presidential fingers," directed at the Congress, gave the President "just about everything he wanted last year."

The legislative process, like government as a whole, is a complex process. Very rarely, if at all, does the Congress pass an administration bill without important changes.

For example, last year the President recommended a 2-year extension of the feed grains program, which is of great importance to my home State of Iowa.

However, the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member, voted out a bill calling for a 4-year extension of the program. It was this recommendation, not the President's, which eventually became law.

And I would also like to point out that, once the committee's bill reached the floor of the House, it was the minority party which gave support to the Presidential recommendation for only a 2-year extension.

March 15, 1966

20th century. Only slowly and painfully did we take even limited steps to assist the Allies in their struggle against Nazi domination in Europe. It was not until our own territory was brutally attacked at Pearl Harbor that we took decisive action.

World War II cost us heavily, yet it cost our European Allies much more; their homes and their cities, their industry and communications, in addition to their manpower. The United States went from war to a renewed prosperity as pentup demand for consumer goods made itself felt dramatically in the marketplace. Europe faced a long and grim struggle to rebuild—within the shadow of yet another aggressor—the Soviet Union.

In 1947, after the grim winter that nearly brought Europe to its knees—we knew that our interests and our obligations would prevent our total demobilization and would prevent our return to the isolationism of the past.

Czechoslovakia fell to the Communists; Greece faced Communist guerrilla forces in her hills; the historic Dardanelles were threatened once more.

The United States made a fundamental decision. Our national security would require a continuing presence around the world—not necessarily a military presence, but a moral presence. The prestige we gained in World War II as a global power; our economic power; our ideological commitment to self-determination, liberty, and world order under law, required that we declare and support our determination to guard the gates of liberty against the hostile forces of oppression—Communist as well as Fascist.

Beginning with the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine and the North Atlantic Treaty we pledged our substance for the defense of freedom. We publicly declared that our interests were engaged around the world. We agreed to meet aggression in Europe, in the Middle East, in Latin America, and in southeast Asia. The United States is a party to mutual defense pacts with more than 50 nations around the globe.

I recite this history not to defend the U.S. role as a kind of global gendarme, but to sober us in assessing our responsibilities. Can we afford the luxury of preoccupation?

If we have learned anything from our 20 years as a global power, we should have learned that our role demands flexibility of response. As we met challenges to freedom in Berlin, in Korea, in Suez, in Lebanon, in Laos, in Cuba, in the Congo, in the Dominican Republic, and now in Vietnam, we recognized that the maintenance of nuclear superiority alone could not preserve the peace. We expanded our capacity to defend against limited wars.

But flexibility means more than the deployment of forces and the balance of nuclear and tactical weapons. It requires a resilience of mind as well. Far too often we have been guilty of intellectual rigidity. Can it be said that our policymakers have become so absorbed in the crisis of the moment that they have lost perspective on the forces and the problems that will confront us for years to come?

We became so convinced that Great Britain would be admitted to the European Common Market that we failed to develop a plan for our relationships with Europe under other circumstances. We still tend to treat General de Gaulle as a temporary nuisance rather than a representative of the new dynamics of a new France.

We were so preoccupied with Europe and China in the 1950's that we virtually ignored Latin America until our Vice President was attacked in Caracas and the Soviet Union gained a foothold in Cuba. It was not until 1960 that President Eisenhower developed a new strategy for the Latin American social revolution which was already in progress.

We were so concerned about the nuclear capability of the Soviet Union that we failed

to perceive the importance of the nuclear efforts going forward in France, in China, in India, and in Israel.

The telltale signs of singlemindedness appear today in the Vietnamese situation. I mentioned a few newspaper headlines of the past week. Each of them raises significant questions for U.S. foreign policy. I am concerned that our top policymakers appear to be giving insufficient attention to the answers.

What is the future of the Atlantic Alliance? As General de Gaulle correctly pointed out, the situation has changed dramatically since the signing of the NATO Treaty in 1949. But economic prosperity and talk of peaceful coexistence should not take us off our guard in Europe. And what of our own commitments? If France withdraws its troops and Britain reduces its entire defense establishment how much American effort will be required to take up the slack?

How long can a new arms race go on in the Middle East before the entire region is embroiled in combat? The resumption of President Nasser's bellicose statements against his Israeli neighbors practically coincide with a resumption of U.S. assistance to Egypt in the form of surplus food sales. Have we permitted short run changes in President Nasser's tactics to dim our view of his long-range intentions in the Middle East?

How did we happen to lose a hydrogen bomb in Spain? Will our inability to find it lead to Spanish efforts to force our withdrawal from strategic military positions in that country? Will the incident impair the effectiveness of our efforts at the disarmament talks in Geneva? Is there anything more important right now than the cessation of proliferation of nuclear capability?

It is now more than 10 months since the beginning of the crisis in the Dominican Republic. Yet the country is still in turmoil with the timetable for free elections seriously set back by a new outbreak of violence. Can we regard our intervention as entirely successful in light of recent reports that an important wing of a major political party has been taken over by Communist forces?

None of these questions has an easy answer. My concern is that we aren't trying hard enough to find the answers.

A nation—like a man—is as good as its word. Can our commitments be credible if we lack the resources to back them up? What is the most appropriate allocation of our men and materiel? The distinguished military editor of the New York Times, Hanson Baldwin, wrote a most disturbing article last week in which he pointed out that "the Nation's armed services have almost exhausted their trained and ready military units, with all available forces spread dangerously thin in Vietnam and elsewhere." Of the 22½ available active divisions cited by the Secretary of Defense in his recent report on our military posture, only 2 or 3 are suitable for combat duty in Vietnam.

The shortages of manpower and equipment found all over the world raise questions about the adequacy of our military planning. They also suggest that shortsighted political thinking coupled with inadequate diplomatic planning may have contributed to our predicament.

If we permit our preoccupation to deepen and our concentration of resources to continue, we may, if confronted with a new explosion in Berlin, Cuba or the Middle East, be virtually incapable of effective response.

It is for this reason that I find the events of the past week hopeful. They demand our distraction and force us to face up to the large questions. Vietnam is today, indeed, the most dramatic and demanding challenge to the free world, but it is by no means the only one, and in the perspective of history it may not prove to have been the most important.

As Sir Winston Churchill remarked in 1947, when we were barely embarked on the new and uncertain adventure of the postwar period: "Our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them."

Asia Scholars, Specialists Support U.S. Viet Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., in its issue of October 23, 1965, appeared a sound and convincing letter signed by Dr. Wesley R. Fishel, and a number of other distinguished scholars and specialists, which I herewith include in my remarks. The convincing opinion of those who are a party to the letter are worthy of profound consideration.

As they well said, and I quote:

If there is any lesson that should have been learned by us since 1919, it is that collective security is the only effective means to deal with totalitarianism on the march.

In connection with this statement, "Lest we forget," we should remember in the 1930's that weak leadership in England and France was an invitation for Hitler to move into the Saar, later Austria, demand and obtain the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia, later took over the remainder of Czechoslovakia and then came Poland and World War II. Firmness in leadership such as shown now by President Johnson, may well have averted World War II.

Unfortunately, arrogant Communist aggression exists in the world of today just the same as it did less than 40 years ago under Hitler and the Nazi regime.

ASIA SCHOLARS, SPECIALISTS SUPPORT U.S. VIET POLICY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD-TIMES:

We, the undersigned, write as scholars and specialists, most of whom have devoted much of their adult lives to study and work in south and east Asian affairs. Included in our number are most of this Nation's small nucleus of specialists of Vietnam. Many of us have lived in Vietnam itself.

We feel compelled to write in response to what we consider the distortions of fact and the emotional allegations of a small, but vociferous, group of fellow university teachers regarding the war in Vietnam. We must first observe that those who have signed advertisements and petitions represent a very small proportion of all university professors. Further, the petition signers include disproportionately fewer scholars in the fields of government, international relations, and Asian studies. To our knowledge, no acknowledged expert on Vietnam itself has signed the advertisements appearing in the New York Times protesting U.S. policy in Vietnam. A mere handful of scholars with Far East credentials identified themselves with these protests.

Quite apart from the merits of American policy—past or present—we believe the manner in which the petitions and many "teach-ins" have been presented is a discredit to those who would call themselves scholars.

March 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1447

In any case, I agree with most of what the editorial says. Two-year House terms are a stimulus to democracy, and frequent elections insure that Congressmen will have a real interest in explaining the legislative process to their constituents.

The editorial from the Iowegian follows:

CONGRESSIONAL TENURE

The President has asked for a constitutional amendment permitting Congressmen to be elected for 4 years rather than 2. This, no doubt, will have the enthusiastic approval of harassed Congressmen who find themselves campaigning most of the time. One must admit that it also has certain virtues.

For one thing, a Congressman could better devote his energy to the legislative business at hand rather than racing back home for every clambake and babbling something that no one remembers at old settler reunions. All this represents a drain on his time, finances, and means he can give the urgent business at hand less attention.

There is also the fact that this affords Congressmen a chance to find out what their job is all about before they face the voters seeking a new lease on his political life.

Yet, there is one phase of the plan that seems so overriding that it washes out the virtues and we simply cannot support the 4-year idea. It will tend to solidify executive power, make it more powerful and in turn weaken legislative influence.

This present Congress is an excellent example. A huge Democratic landslide swept a two-thirds majority into office. The President got just about everything he wanted last year. A snap of the Presidential fingers and Congress responded, especially the House of Representatives.

The idea of allowing this kind of a situation to prevail without the people having some voice or chance to vote a new mandate doesn't impress us as the wise thing to do. The people need frequent checks on their government, and this 2-year accounting Congress faces is an excellent way of maintaining our checks and balances. The year 1966 should be an accounting year, not 1968. Every 2 years the entire House of Representatives has to stand up and be counted and if the people aren't pleased with the ways things are going, this is an excellent avenue of expression.

Government has a way of growing away from the people. For one thing it is so complex, difficult to understand. But by bringing all the Members of the House of Representatives to an accounting each 2 years, most certainly this wing of Government is going to stay pretty well attuned to the people. We like this and want to see it retained.

It is also a way of telling the President how people feel about the trend of events. This private check by the people is so desirable that we simply cannot approve the 4-year idea.

Traders With Hanoi Face Rough Going

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the continuing conduct of free world trade with North Vietnam while thousands of our boys are in daily combat in the south is deeply disturbing the American people. Just as disturbing has

been the administration's policy of keeping the true facts about this traffic from the American people and its don't-rock-the-boat approach to bringing an end to this shocking aid and comfort to our enemy.

My colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has devoted himself to the task of digging out the facts and pressing our Government to take stronger measures to dry up this source of supply to a nation on an all-out war economy. The information he has made available has had its legislative impact with the Congress, both in this session and last, approving floor amendments, not requested by the administration, prohibiting foreign aid to any country which allows its flag vessels to carry goods to or from North Vietnam.

It is indeed encouraging therefore to find that the efforts of Congressman CHAMBERLAIN are being recognized both here in Congress and back home as well. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I am pleased to make available to my colleagues an editorial appearing in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., on Wednesday, March 9, 1966, entitled "Traders With Hanoi Face Rough Going":

TRADERS WITH HANOI FACE ROUGH GOING

The economic waters are becoming increasingly rough for free world ocean commerce with Communist North Vietnam.

Late in February, U.S. Representative CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, Republican, of Lansing, who has taken the lead in Congress in opposing such shipping, reported that the U.S. State Department had at long last decided to bar ships carrying goods to and from North Vietnam ports from carrying cargoes financed in any way by the U.S. Government.

This report was followed by announcement that the AFL-CIO maritime union planned to boycott ships of nations trading with North Vietnam.

Three top leaders of the maritime workers said last week after a meeting with Under Secretary of State Thomas C. Mann that the threat of the boycott already had cut down shipments to the Hanoi regime. One of them said the threat of tieups had produced assurances from some foreign ship owners that they will not carry goods to North Vietnam, which is supporting Red aggression against South Vietnam.

In Athens, it was announced that Greece had banned all ships under its flag from sailing to or from North Vietnam.

The announcement said the move was made to protect the lives of the crews and the security of the ships because of dangerous war conditions around Hanoi, capital of North Vietnam. It also was said that Greek ships on charter would be allowed to fulfill present contracts but the charterers will have the right to serve notice of cancellation.

Apparently in line with the State Department's blacklist, the U.S. Agriculture Department has announced that it will bar—with certain exceptions—shipment of food and other farm product cargoes on foreign-flag vessels which have called at any North Vietnam port on or after January 25.

This action will apply to all programs of the Agriculture Department, including food for peace and world food program shipments.

Exceptions will be made if vessel owners give satisfactory assurances that no ships under their control will be employed in future trade with North Vietnam.

The maritime union leaders went ahead with their boycott plan in spite of a State

Department plea that the problem be handled on a government-to-government basis.

The maritime workers have had good reason to feel that Washington was not trying to discourage free world trade with Hanoi as effectively as it could have.

Official claims have been made that free world ships have not been carrying anything of strategic value to North Vietnam but even if this is true anything that benefits the economy of the Communists strengthens their ability to wage war against the South Vietnamese and the Americans who are fighting and dying in resisting Red aggression.

We congratulate the maritime union leadership for taking a more realistic and sensible view of the Hanoi trade issue than some officials in Washington have been taking until recently.

We also commend Representative CHAMBERLAIN for keeping up the fight in the face of what must have appeared to be discouraging odds.

Keynote Address of the Honorable F. Bradford Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the RECORD the attached keynote address of my colleague, the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE, before the Massachusetts Junior Chamber of Commerce Governmental Affairs Seminar:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN F. BRADFORD MORSE, BEFORE THE MASSACHUSETTS JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS SEMINAR, YANKEE DRUMMER INN, AUBURN, MASS., FEBRUARY 26, 1966

Anyone who read the newspapers this week had cause to be depressed about the State of the world and the effectiveness of U.S. foreign policy. General de Gaulle announced that he would withdraw French forces from NATO and insist on national control of all military bases when the present NATO Treaty expires in 1969. Great Britain engaged in an acrimonious debate about the decision to reduce her defense establishment by one-third over the next 4 years. President Nasser of the United Arab Republic told a Cairo audience that it might be necessary for the United Arab Republic to wage a preventive war against Israel.

The failure of the United States to find a lost hydrogen bomb in the tomato fields of Palomares threatened to disrupt our defense arrangements with Spain and to complicate our efforts to reach agreement on a nuclear nonproliferation treaty in Geneva. Violence again shattered the fragile truce in the Dominican Republic. Military coups ousted governments in Syria and Ghana.

All of these things are cause for concern; yet I think they may be a hopeful sign. A sign that we will, as a nation, snap out of our total preoccupation with Vietnam and remember that the leader of the forces of the free world cannot forget its strategic responsibilities elsewhere around the globe.

It has been just about two decades since the leadership of the free world was thrust upon the United States. We did not seek that leadership. Indeed, throughout the 1930's we sought to avoid "entangling alliances" as though the counsel of George Washington in 1796 was appropriate to the

March 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

The Vietnamese war and its related political context are enormously complex. Even most qualified experts disagree on important facts or the meaning of those facts. It is no surprise that they also disagree on alternative courses of action.

It serves no useful purpose, therefore, to engage in name calling, distortion, emotionalism, and gross oversimplification. Many of our fellow scholars, no doubt eminently qualified in their own fields, are in our view guilty of unacademic behavior in their protests of Vietnam policy.

For the record, therefore, we feel compelled to make the following assertions of fact:

1. The Vietcong initiated the present war in South Vietnam. They did so in gradual stages, beginning with assassination, terror, and bellicose propaganda. This was followed by sabotage, subversion, and small-scale guerrilla attacks; in later stages, large-scale frontal assaults were employed. Only in the last stage did the U.S. Government feel compelled to increase its military involvement substantially.

2. The Vietcong is a Communist-led and Communist-controlled political movement. Its aim is to establish, by any available means, a Communist rule in South Vietnam.

3. It is false to compare the war now being fought in Vietnam with that which was fought by the French between 1946 and 1954. That was a colonial war, fought by Vietnamese of every variety of political complexions to achieve national independence. The Government of Vietnam since 1954 has been a truly Vietnamese national regime, and it is fighting now to maintain its independence. That it is not without faults goes without saying. This, however, is not the issue. Surely it is of some significance that not one prominent nationalist of all the thousands of such men in South Vietnam has defected to the Communists since 1954.

4. The People's Revolutionary Party, which leads the Vietcong, is a segment of the Lao Dong (Communist) Party of North Vietnam. The Vietcong itself was organized by the North Vietnamese, armed by the North Vietnamese, and trained by the North Vietnamese. This is not to deny the fact that many of its cadres were originally born in South Vietnam, and later trained or indoctrinated in the north. Nor is it to deny that thousands of South Vietnamese were persuaded or forced to join the Vietcong in the south.

5. The Vietcong have employed methods of terror, torture, and outright murder that, on a smaller scale, rival the atrocities of the Axis Powers in World War II. Thousands of innocent people (including women and children) have been deliberately slaughtered by the Vietcong as "examples" for the South Vietnamese. Beheading and mutilation are not uncommon. For American academics to bemoan the "brutality" of the South Vietnamese response, without the slightest comment on the initiators of the brutality, is the epitome of bias.

6. The Communist regime in North Vietnam is among the harshest and most brutal in Asia. All opposition has been exterminated. The society is organized into cells of mutual surveillance. No free elections of any kind have been permitted. The living standards of the people are low even by Asian standards.

7. In contrast, the people of South Vietnam, until the stepped up Vietcong attack, were enjoying a far better living standard. Hunger was virtually eliminated. Industries were expanding. Schools, clinics, and social welfare services were proliferating rapidly. Between 1954 and 1961, there were four elections, conducted with varying degrees of freedom.

8. The Geneva accords were broken first and repeatedly by the Communists, as docu-

mented by the records of the International Controls Commission.

9. The President has offered to hold unconditional peace talks with Hanoi and has been rejected repeatedly by Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow. The burden of proof is now on the Communists.

10. Communist conquest of South Vietnam would, in our view, lead inevitably to a deterioration of resolve throughout south and southeast Asia. While the non-Communist states in the region are not likely to fall in actual geographical sequence (i.e., the "domino" theory), we believe these nations would eventually succumb politically and/or militarily to Chinese expansion following an American withdrawal from Vietnam. We further believe that Chinese hegemony over southeast Asia would be disastrous to American national interest and will severely compromise the capacity of Japan, the Philippines, India, and Pakistan to survive as independent nations.

If there is any lesson that should have been learned by us since 1919, it is that collective security is the only effective means to deal with totalitarianism on the march. Our negotiations and agreements must not be "Munichs." Rather they must be backed by clear evidence of our determination to maintain the arrangements agreed to as the conditions for peace. Men who prize liberty are unwilling to settle for peace at any price. Nor does negotiation from weakness and without conditions serve to placate imperial ambitions. The surest guarantee of peace in Asia is what it has always been everywhere: Recognition by all that our commitments to our allies will be honored. And we shall use the peace thus secured as Americans used it in post-war Europe, and as President Johnson has pledged to use it for Asia. The basis for a lasting settlement in Asia will be built as we create the conditions for freedom through social and economic programs no less than through military means.

Organizational affiliations are listed for identification purposes only: Dr. Wesley R. Fishel, Michigan State University; Prof. P. J. Honey, University of London; William P. Maddox, New York City; Prof. Ralph L. Turner, Michigan State University; Dr. Charles Wolf, Jr., the Rand Corp.; Dr. George E. Taylor, University of Washington; Prof. William B. Dunn, University of the State of New York; Prof. John D. Montgomery, Harvard University; Dr. Charles A. Joiner, Temple University; William Henderson, Socony Mobil Oil Co.; Dr. Frank N. Trager, New York University; Rev. Francis J. Corley, S.J., St. Louis University; Dr. Chester L. Hunt, Western Michigan University; Dr. Lucian Pye, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. David A. Wilson, University of California; Dr. Amrom H. Katz, the Rand Corp.; Dr. John T. Dorsey, Vanderbilt University; Dr. I. Milton Sacks, Brandeis University; Dr. Ralph H. Smuckler, Michigan State University; George K. Tanham, the Rand Corp.

Dairymen Aroused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, dairy farmers in New Jersey's Second District, which I have the honor to represent, are understandably exercised over the announced intention of the U.S. Depart-

ment of Agriculture to suspend Federal milk marketing order No. 4, which presently covers our area, and place Delaware Valley milk producers under milk marketing ordering No. 2, which now covers the northern New Jersey-New York area.

Hearings on the USDA's plan to change the current status of Delaware Valley dairy farmers have been held but, to date, no change has been officially announced. Numerous meetings have been held in Washington between dairy farmers now included under order No. 4 and their congressional representatives and with officials of the USDA.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues two editorials commenting on this situation which give an idea of the situation which our dairy farmers will face if the USDA follows its announced plan. The first is from the Bridgeton, N.J., Evening News, one of the daily papers in the second district; and the second appeared in New Jersey Better Farming. This is a matter of deep concern to me and to my constituents, and I am, therefore, inserting these editorials in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Bridgeton (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 8, 1966]

DAIRYMEN AROUSED

A dispute which has raged quietly behind the scenes and threatens to come to a head soon pits the U.S. Department of Agriculture against most of the 5,800 dairymen who supply milk to the Greater Philadelphia area.

While milk prices to consumers are not involved, we feel that the dispute is the business of everyone in the Philadelphia milkshed, which includes Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, because action threatened by the Department of Agriculture would deprive the milk farmers of \$10 million a year in income. And that is a concern of all businessmen in the area, for such a loss to the economy of any area is not to be passed over lightly.

The dispute, as we understand it, centers about two principal points: One is that the Department of Agriculture contends that it cannot enforce the present milk marketing order against violations by a handful of chislers who undercut minimum price provisions by giving kickbacks to brokers or other middlemen. The other is that dairy interests primarily serving the New York market want to absorb the Philadelphia market, as they did the New Jersey market several years ago. What appears to be clear is that the Philadelphia milkshed farmers are doing better under their order than the New York-New Jersey farmers are doing under theirs.

The change which the Department of Agriculture proposes, under prodding by overwhelmingly stronger and more numerous New York interests, would at the very least result in a loss of 50 cents per hundred-weight of milk income to Philadelphia milkshed farmers, while New York market dairymen would increase their take by 6 cents per hundredweight. That would result in a \$10 million annual loss to the economy of the Delaware Valley.

As we see it, the Philadelphia order should be amended to make it enforceable and it should be enforced. To abandon it, or change it to a different market form either because of pressure from elsewhere or from frustration does not seem to us to be a defensible position for the Department of Agriculture.

March 15, 1966

[From New Jersey Better Farming]

MILK MATTERS

The controversy over the future role of the Delaware Valley milk marketing order continues unabated. On the political scene, Pennsylvania's two U.S. Senators have made strong appeals for retention of order No. 4.

Senator HUGH SCOTT informed the Secretary of Agriculture that hearings concluded last November on the USDA's proposal to abandon the order in favor of another form of marketing "showed that 90 percent of the dairy farmers and handlers under the order want it retained with amendments to render it more enforceable."

The USDA proposal to abandon the present order is based on its claimed inability to enforce it against minimum price infractions.

Senator SCOTT said that "these 5,400 dairy farmers and their communities would stand to suffer a loss of \$10 million a year if the Department did not retain the present type of marketing order."

This order provides for a so-called handler pool of a type in effect in the market for 23 years. It regulates the marketing of milk in greater Philadelphia, covering dairy farmers in Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and south Jersey.

OTHER SUPPORT

Senator JOSEPH CLARK wrote Secretary Freeman that since the type of milk marketing pool has no direct effect upon consumer prices, he felt that order No. 4 producer interests and desires should be supported.

A number of other Members of Congress from the order No. 4 area have urged that the present order be retained and provided with "enforcement teeth."

The Interstate Milk Producers' Cooperative, Philadelphia, which supports retention of the handler-type pool in the order No. 4 area, told the USDA, in a recent brief, that "the Department has the full cooperation of Federal courts, when it chooses to enforce the milk marketing order for the Delaware Valley marketing area. The only question," it said, "is whether or not the Secretary of Agriculture chooses to abdicate his duty."

In refuting the USDA's contention that it cannot enforce the order, Interstate cited two 1965 cases in the Federal courts which it said demonstrated this cooperation of the courts.

An opponent of Interstate's stand, the United Milk Producers Cooperative of New Jersey, has proposed combining the New York (order No. 2) and Philadelphia milkshed marketing orders.

Pennsylvania: First in Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 14, 1966, Gov. William W. Scranton transmitted the following message to the Pennsylvania State General Assembly on the subject—"Pennsylvania: First in Highways."

MESSAGE TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY BY GOV. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON, PENNSYLVANIA: FIRST IN HIGHWAYS, MARCH 14, 1966

Mr. Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Speaker, members of the general assembly, Pennsylvania: First in highways.

A noble ideal—but also a realistic goal. A goal that is rapidly being realized.

We have not set out to become first in highways simply to light up the sky. We are not fascinated with bigness for its own sake.

We believe that Pennsylvania must have the best highway system in the Nation, because improved highways mean expanding industry, mean more jobs, mean better safety conditions, mean driver convenience for each and every citizen of the Commonwealth.

The location of our State is uniquely fortunate. We form the bridge between the two most prosperous market areas in the world—the eastern seaboard and the Great Lakes region of the Midwest. To take full economic advantage of this blessing of geography, we must provide a highway system that will channel the riches of both of these regions into our cities and into our rural heartland.

Highways will bring us industry, distribution centers, tourists, new homeowners, new research centers, new entire communities.

And that is not all. Highways will link together our own cities into a network for economic and social interchange. Highways will provide ready access between the large cities and their suburbs. Highways will offer new leisure time opportunities to our increasingly prosperous people.

This is the future prospect. It is swiftly becoming the present fact.

We are now entering the second year of the gigantic 10-year highway construction program that was launched at the midpoint of this administration.

Every index shows that we are reaching the intermediate goals that we established for this program.

Let us look briefly at the accomplishments of the year just passed.

Construction expenditures—the actual money paid out for miles of highway completed—rose from \$230 million in 1964 to \$255 million in 1965—an increase of more than 10 percent.

But the more meaningful figure is that of construction awards—showing the amounts that have been authorized to contractors for construction along our highways. This figure rose from \$234 million in 1964 to \$296 million in 1965—a whopping increase of 26 percent. Both years were new record highs for Pennsylvania.

Other guidelines show the same story: total mileage advertised—up 10 percent; maintenance construction—up 8 percent; interstate miles opened—up 57.6 percent.

Figures alone do not reveal the full extent of our progress.

One year ago I said that we must tool up the Department of Highways to make possible the most rapidly expanded road building program in American history, and that we must free the highway program of the vicissitudes of regional and party politics. Both objectives are clearly within reach.

Businesslike procedures have been installed throughout the department of highways—that former musty stronghold of antiquated methods. Computers have replaced laborious manual systems of calculation. Engineers have been freed for creative services—one operation that formerly required eight full days of work by a professional engineer is now completed in 2 hours.

For the first time in highway department history, we have an accurate forecasting system for more than 1,500 road building projects. Every other week, schedules are checked to make sure construction dates are being met. The old predict-and-pray method of construction scheduling has been replaced by a clockwork procedure.

The State highway commission, a major reform accomplished in this administration, has meanwhile given continuity and consistency to the allocation of highway proj-

ects. No longer do the highways go only to those counties with great political pull, or to counties which are controlled by the party in power in the State. Construction awards are made on a system of priorities, based on need.

This month the highway commission will begin a series of public meetings in all 11 highway districts, to determine where the next additions to the highway program will be made. These decisions will not be subject to change by the next administration, regardless of which party wins this year's election. Pennsylvania, at last, has a long-range highway building program.

In the next fiscal year, we will make further dramatic increases in construction expenditures and construction authorizations. The total budget for 1966-67 will be \$625.-469,254—a 10 percent increase over last year. (Included in this sum is \$68,100,000 of State highway and bridge authority expenditures.)

Construction expenditures are projected to rise to \$320.6 million in fiscal 1966-67. This continues the sharp acceleration that has been underway since 1963. In 1965-66 we at last are breaking through the legendary \$250 million construction year limit. Next year we expect to achieve better than a \$300 million construction year.

The rise in construction awards is even more startling. For purposes of comparison, we will use low bids on projects advertised to establish this trend, since our data on actual authorizations is incomplete beyond the last few years. Note that in the first highway budget submitted by this administration in 1963-64, we called for projects advertised in the amount of \$207 million—then the second highest figure ever projected for that purpose. Our final budget calls for \$400 million to be allocated for low bids on projects advertised—an increase in 4 years of almost 100 percent.

Truly this is progress.

Construction costs—including the costs of engineering and right-of-way purchase—account for 64 percent of the total highway budget for 1966-67. These figures represent road and bridge improvements for every county in the Commonwealth.

Consider some outstanding examples of projects on which substantial progress will be made during the next fiscal year:

All 313 miles of the Keystone Shortway will either be open to the public or under construction—well in advance of its original schedule.

The long-awaited Holtwood Bridge, which for decades has floated like a tantalizing promise before the people of Lancaster and York Counties, will begin to become a reality.

In Pittsburgh, the "Bridge to Nowhere" will at last begin to go somewhere.

In Philadelphia, construction will continue on the Delaware Expressway and other sections of some of the most expensive highway building in the Nation.

Along the northern tier, renewal of Route 6 will be pushed ahead. Construction of the Corry Bypass and the Youngsville Bypass will begin.

In Scranton, the Spruce Street Bridge will be built.

In the remainder of the Anthracite Region, construction will proceed on the Anthracite Expressway, and the first segments of Interstate 84, providing a direct route to the markets of New England, will be financed.

In the suburban counties surrounding Philadelphia, bypass construction will begin at Coatesville, West Chester, and Sellersville.

In the west, work will start on the Allegheny Expressway and the Beaver Valley Expressway.

These are but a few of the projects included in the challenging construction schedule planned for the next fiscal year.

March 15, 1966

A1454

LEGISLATION TO TAX "RELATED" BUSINESS INCOME

Beyond this, it is my hope that after the pending House Ways and Means Committee study of foundation abuses, Congress will see fit to propose legislation to tax the related business income—as well as the unrelated business income—of tax-exempt organizations. Some 15 years of history under the 1950 corrective legislation proves the inadequacy of this distinction in curbing abuses and unfair competition.

Today, for example, the publication of magazines or books might be considered related to the tax-exempt purposes of an organization created to foster education or the literary arts. If so, the organization could enter the publishing field in sharp competition with private business. The consequences are clear; for the problem of related business can be even more serious than that posed by unrelated business. Unrelated business income, despite other unfair competitive aspects, is at least subject to tax; profits from related business may be completely tax exempt.

To the private businessman actively competing with businesses controlled by tax-exempt organizations, it is inconsequential whether such business is related or unrelated to the tax-exempt purposes. As a minimum, his plea for equity asks that those entering the marketplace be placed on an equal tax footing.

Many exempt organizations are making a major contribution to our society. Most of them shy away from anything approaching active business functions. They rely primarily on passive income, such as contributions, dues, dividends, interest, rent, royalties, and the like. To them, the operation of a business would be regarded as incompatible with the traditional view of tax exemption, and altogether inappropriate and diversionary from their basic charitable purposes.

Tax exemption is a great privilege in our society; it is a privilege which should be respected and handled with care. With it goes a large measure of responsibility.

To merit this privilege exempt organizations must retain public confidence. They should get out of active business and stick to their charitable or educational purposes. For their financing they should rely on passive income of the types discussed above.

Our governmental leaders are becoming more and more sensitive to the growing problems created by business activities of exempt organizations. Positive action at this time can help cure the resulting distortion and inequities which serve only to weaken our free, competitive enterprise system.

It is my hope that, as a part of the action on foundations called for by the President, this entire issue will be met head on, both by the Treasury and the Congress, and that the result will be full taxation of all income of business activities conducted by exempt organizations—whether related or unrelated to their educational, scientific, or charitable purposes.

McNamara Farewell: "Thanks for Use of Hall"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from Michigan, PAT McNAMARA, will not be forgotten in his retirement.

Senator McNAMARA has eschewed pretense and fancy public relations during his two terms as U.S. Senator. With a brevity and terseness of expression that was truly refreshing, he went to the heart of issues and we are the better for it. Indeed, his legislative contributions in education and medical care for the aged have been historic.

I am proud to have served in the Michigan delegation under his leadership.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD a recent informal testimonial written by the distinguished syndicated columnist, Edwin A. Lahey. The article follows:

McNAMARA FAREWELL: "THANKS FOR USE OF HALL"

(By Edwin A. Lahey)

WASHINGTON.—It can be truly said of Senator PAT McNAMARA that Washington never got to him.

PAT quits public life at the end of this session of Congress. And his valedictory to the people of Michigan who sent him to the U.S. Senate for two terms will be as moving, in its own way, as Washington's farewell address.

The Senator tried the valedictory on me at lunch the other day. When he walks out of the Chambers of the greatest deliberative body on earth, he will just say:

"Thanks for the use of the Hall."

It takes a pretty good man to leave this town with the same modesty and sense of humor that he had when he was sworn in to high office. Senator McNAMARA and his wife Mary both have been untouched by Washington. Mary is probably the only Senate wife in modern history who does her husband's shirts.

McNAMARA has had the greatest respect for the office of Senator, and for his powerful posts on the Senate Labor and Public Works Committees. This respect for the office he occupies has given PAT a fierce spirit of independence. The White House, the labor leaders who grew up with him, have all felt the impact of the McNAMARA independence.

The real secret of McNAMARA's stature is that he has never confused himself personally with the office. He has never lost the sense of agency, the feeling that he represented the people of Michigan. He always knew that intrinsically, PAT McNAMARA was a steamfitter who got lucky.

The sense of agency and the humility that has gone with it during his 12 years in the U.S. Senate now make it possible for PAT McNAMARA to walk off the world stage without tears.

"What the hell," says Senator PAT gruffly, munching away at a Senate dining room steak with a gusto that would shock his physician. "People like you and me never had anything in life, and it isn't so hard to step out for younger people."

"These purple robes of office never overwhelmed me when I came here, and putting them off isn't going to fracture me when I go away."

PAT McNAMARA did not have to quit the Senate. The respect for him would probably have made reelection for a third term easy, despite his age. (He will be 72 on October 4.)

The greatest tribute that could be paid to McNAMARA is that not for one moment has he ever entertained the desire to remain in the spotlight, or to have another term in the Senate for reasons of personal glorification.

For months it has been in the cards that the Senator would announce his intention to retire this year. For those hoping to succeed McNAMARA in the Senate, the announcement seemed a long time coming.

But I can testify personally that Senator PAT's timing for his announcement was at

all times dictated by concerns other than his own career.

PAT and Mary McNAMARA will return to Detroit late this year as rare examples of people in high places who were never touched by the temptations of the Washington atmosphere. They will return owing nobody anything, with nobody owing them, and with the freedom and sense of independence that gives such an appropriateness to PAT's farewell address:

"Thanks for the use of the Hall"

Why U.S. Viet Policy Lacks Friends—Our Credibility Destroyed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion of late as to the derivation of the term "credibility gap."

I personally do not believe it is important to pinpoint the term's derivation. I do, however, believe it is important to the future of our Nation to recognize that there is a problem of credibility today.

I submit the following article from the December 5, 1965, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times, in which Thomas B. Rose discusses the credibility rating of the U.S. Government:

WHY U.S. VIET POLICY LACKS FRIENDS—OUR CREDIBILITY DESTROYED

(By Thomas B. Rose)

WASHINGTON.—Defense Secretary Robert S. McNAMARA has offered an unusually frank explanation of why the United States is having such difficulty winning friends for its Vietnamese policy: "The trouble is our credibility was destroyed."

McNAMARA was referring specifically, in an interview last week, to the disclosure that the United States, despite repeated denials, had rejected a peace feeler by Communist North Vietnam in the fall of 1964.

The United States, as this reporter recently learned during an extensive trip through Africa and the Middle East, is suffering from a crisis of credibility.

Not only doctrinaire leftists and neutrals but even those who consider themselves friends of the United States have come to suspect the official statements of the U.S. Government.

And the suspicion, as this reporter learned at a White House conference here last week, now has spread to sizable portions of the American public, particularly in the academic community.

Persistently, conference participants demanded to know why the United States did not stop its bombing of North Vietnam in an effort to promote negotiations.

Repeatedly, Government spokesmen replied that North Vietnam constantly had rebuffed diplomatic appeals by the United States that it indicate some willingness to make a peace gesture in return for a halt in the air raids.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk delivered probably his most eloquent explanation of U.S. policy in an attempt to convince the critics. But despite a standing ovation for his impassioned efforts, it was evident that he had made few converts.

Many of the Vietnam protesters of course, have closed their minds. But others have reluctantly fallen into a state of disbelief under the impact of a long string of mis-

March 15, 1966

A1453

The forum was devoted to Washington considerations affecting the business press. I discussed the need of increased expenditures for postal mechanization. Mr. Knox covered the necessity of disseminating results of the \$16 billion per annum Federal Government research program. Mr. Caplin discussed the need for applying the unrelated business tax to profits derived from advertising in publications issued by tax-exempt organizations.

Mr. Caplin's comments on this subject are of the utmost importance, particularly in view of the Treasury Department's current interest in the subject. Mr. Caplin's statement, which I include in the RECORD, carries forward the President's request to Congress to "deal with abuses of tax-exempt private foundations."

However, it is that portion of his remarks relating to Treasury's proposed regulations on advertising which I believe so timely and significant. I likewise concur that these regulations ought to be issued soon, and commend the comments of the former Commissioner of Internal Revenue to all Members of Congress, as most thoughtful.

The above mentioned follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF MORTIMER M. CAPLIN ON "LEGISLATION TO CURB BUSINESS COMPETITION FROM TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS"

In his economic report of January 27, 1966, the President stated: "Against a background calling for fiscal restraint, I cannot this year endorse any specific legislative measure, however meritorious, involving significant net tax reduction." The President did go on to state, however, that "improvement of our tax system is a continuing need which will concern this administration, and which deserves the support of all Americans." "We must constantly seek," he said "improvements in the tax code in the interests of equity and of sound economic policy."

One major goal was said to be "simplification of the tax law."

Another stated aim was "a more equitable distribution of the tax load."

"Finally," the President stated, "we must review special tax preferences. In a fully employed economy, special tax benefits to stimulate some activities or investments mean that we will have less of other activities."

One specific tax reform was selected, which the President said "can be accomplished this year." With that he added: "I call upon the Congress to deal with abuses of tax-exempt private foundations."

Why is the subject of tax abuses by private foundations of interest to the American Business Press, an association of specialized business publications?

TREASURY REPORT ON FOUNDATIONS

In response to the investigation and reports of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, the Treasury Department on February 2, 1965, issued a report on private foundations. Overall, the record of foundations was found to be a good one. Most foundations substantially comply with the tax law. At the same time, instances of serious abuse were pointed to, and corrective legislation was called for.

The Treasury listed six categories of major problems:

1. Self-dealing.
2. Delay in benefits to charity.
3. Family use of foundations to control corporate and other properties.
4. Financial transactions unrelated to charitable functions.

5. Need to broaden foundation management.

6. Foundation involvement in business activities.

It is this last finding, "foundation involvement in business," that particularly concerns the American Business Press, as well as any other group of businessmen. Business activities of foundations and other tax-exempt organizations are not isolated phenomena. On the contrary, many of these organizations are deeply involved in active business, which creates serious difficulties.

First, tax exemption gives them a sharp competitive advantage over regular businesses.

Second, the exempt status provides opportunities and temptations for varied forms of self-dealing.

Third, the management of these exempt organizations is diverted to concentrate on commercial operations rather than the stated purposes of the organization which gave rise to tax exemption. To use the words of the Treasury report: "Business may become the end of the organization; charity, an insufficiently considered and mechanically accomplished afterthought."

The competitive advantages of tax-exempt organizations are great. At the outset, they are free of the normal demands of investors for profits and dividend distributions. Instead, free of tax, they can reinvest the greater part of their profits in expansion and modernization. These organizations are not subject to the tax rules which prohibit unreasonable accumulations of income for the purpose of avoiding the tax on shareholders. Thus, their capital buildup can be accomplished on a sustained basis, augmented by such items as dues and other deductible contributions; dividends, interest, rent and other types of passive income; and by a type of income referred to as related business income.

In evaluating the business advantages of tax-exempt organizations, the Treasury pointed out that these advantages "contribute materially to the ability . . . to subsidize its businesses during periods of difficulty, and to expand them during periods of growth." Regular businesses, in turn, "must pay for their acquisition, finance their operations, and support their expansion programs with the funds which remain after taxes have been paid."

Many businesses conducted by tax-exempt organizations can cut prices and still have a normal profit return. Is it reasonable or equitable to ask a fully taxed business to function in the marketplace against this type of unfair competition? Does this type of special tax preference meet President Johnson's standard of tax equity and of sound economic policy?

The answer readily suggests itself: Tax-exempt organizations competing side by side with regular business enterprises should pay their way. They should not be able to trade on their tax exemption or other tax benefits. They should meet competitors on an equal tax footing, and carry their fair share of the Nation's tax burden. This applies to all tax-exempt organizations, foundations or otherwise, as well as to those with other tax privileges.

TAXATION OF UNRELATED BUSINESS INCOME

In 1950, Congress attempted to cope with certain aspects of business competition from exempt organizations. Congress provided for taxation of the income derived from any unrelated trade or business covering, for example, such items as the income earned by New York University from a macaroni business, as well as other types of unrelated activities. The statutory language used was "any trade or business the conduct of which is not substantially related (aside from the need of such organization for income or funds or the use it makes of the profits derived) to the exercise or performance by such organi-

zation of its charitable, education, or other purpose or function constituting the basis of its exemption."

Although this tax on unrelated business income has been on the statute books for over 15 years, the law has been slow in developing on the exact meaning of this term. What are the outer limits of unrelated business income?

One thing is clear: Congress was seeking to correct an abuse and to eliminate unfair competition from tax-exempt organizations. As the tax-writing committees indicated in their 1943 studies, they approached the problem "with the view to closing this existing loophole and requiring the payment of tax and the protection of legitimate companies against this unfair competitive situation." It is plain that the concept of unrelated business income should be broadly interpreted and that there should be brought within its broad sweep (1) any regularly conducted business activity of a tax-exempt organization (2) which competes side by side with an ordinary taxable business entity, and (3) which carries out its affairs much in the same manner as its taxable competitors.

PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO TAX ADVERTISING INCOME

Today the Internal Revenue Service and the Treasury Department are at the crossroads in reaching an important decision on the taxability of unrelated business income. The pending issue relates to the taxability of the advertising revenue of otherwise tax-exempt publications.

Many organizations, in the name of education or charity or otherwise, have published and distributed magazines and other periodicals under the claim that the income therefrom is related to their principal purpose and therefore is not subject to tax. Further, these tax-exempt organizations urge that the advertising revenue derived by them in connection with these publications is similarly not "unrelated" business income, and is similarly not subject to tax. For some time the IRS and Treasury have been considering the advisability of publishing proposed regulations which would make it clear that this advertising revenue—aggressively pursued by many of these tax-exempt organizations—is not substantially related to the exercise or performance of charitable, educational or similar purposes.

The advertising revenue received by tax-exempt publications is sizable. It is estimated at over \$70 million a year. The content of the advertising is often totally unrelated to the purposes of the magazine. These publishers frequently are in a position to cut their advertising rates, passing along to their customers part of the benefits of tax exemption. At times this is done without fanfare, with the fact speaking for itself; on other occasions, tax-exempt publications have engaged in active solicitation of advertising revenue, baldly stating that they were able to cut rates only because of their tax-exempt status.

Need I say more about the unfairness of this type of open competition? Need I say more about the sharp adverse reaction which emanates from the fully taxable businessman, who is forced to compete in this setting?

In my view, the Treasury would be fully justified and would be on sound legal grounds in proposing regulations which would impose a tax on the advertising revenue of otherwise tax-exempt publications. Such regulations would be entirely consistent with the major premise of the 1950 tax on unrelated business income. And I believe the Treasury should follow the policy written into the law and fashion regulations consistent with the viewpoint of eliminating this unfair competition of so-called non-profit organizations.

March 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1455

leading statements by the leaders of their Government.

Those who work for the Government, in other nations as well as here, have developed a protective sophistication in such matters. (Diplomats at the United Nations reportedly dismissed the disclosure about the North Vietnamese peace feeler as a commonplace example of governmental truth shaving.)

But the earnest, sometimes innocent, people who are attracted to the Vietnam policy protests find it difficult to tolerate such practices. They are not close enough to the sources of information to read between the lines, nor close enough to the seats of power to sympathize with the problems of Government officials.

They have followed the news closely enough, however, to recall that high government officials have been caught repeatedly in the last few years in erroneous statements about Vietnam, the Bay of Pigs, the U-2 spy plane, and the Cuban missile crisis.

They have developed an uneasy feeling that information about Government policy is being manipulated in such a way that even the conscientious citizen is being deprived of the rudimentary material upon which to base an informed opinion.

Government officials, of course, have protested that this is grossly unfair. They have insisted, as did Rusk in his speech last week, that the American people are given more information about their Government than any other citizens in the world.

Misleading statements, they have declared, are issued only at rare intervals and only to protect vital national interests. In short, they have tended to dismiss the problem out of hand as an affront to their honesty and integrity.

But now thousands of Americans are being asked to give their lives in Vietnam on faith that their leaders have told the truth to them about the war they are fighting. The crisis in credibility is no longer a personal problem for officialdom. It has become a national problem of the first magnitude.

Federal Meat Inspection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle which comments on the pending legislation to shift the cost of Federal meat inspection from the Government to the meat industry.

I join the Press-Chronicle in opposing this proposed legislation.

The following editorial offers some food for thought, and I pass it along to the readers of the RECORD:

KEEP IT AS IT IS

A bill has been introduced in Congress to shift the cost of Federal meat inspection from the Government to the meat industry. It has met with strong criticism from industry leaders.

A statement by the American Meat Institute, the National Independent Meat Packers Association, and the Western States Meat Packers Association goes to the heart of the matter. In their words, "In 1906, Congress established the principle that the cost of meat inspection should be borne by the Government as an essential public health service.

This principle was reaffirmed by the Congress in 1948.

"It is wrong in principle and contrary to the public interest when a regulatory agency of the Government is paid for by the industry it regulates."

Meat inspection is not a voluntary service. It is mandatory for products moving in interstate commerce and currently covers about 85 percent of all commercial livestock slaughter in this country. Meat inspection is a public health activity. It is administered by a Government agency, the Department of Agriculture. It is a proper obligation of the Government.

Fifth District of Kansas Responds to Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the response to my questionnaire for the residents of the Fifth District of Kansas has been overwhelming this year. The returns have not been coming in by the hundreds—they are coming in by the thousands, and our mail is delivered by the bag these days.

A great many of the questionnaires have been accompanied by letters from concerned constituents. One can judge by the remarks in the letters how well this form of communication is being received by the people.

Recently I received a letter from a constituent in Chanute, Kans., explaining how the people in her township plan to hold a meeting to discuss the questions raised in my questionnaire. With the consent granted I want to share this with those who might be interested. The letter follows:

DEAR FRIEND JOE: This evening we have a township meeting for Duck Creek and Talley-Rand at La Fontaine School to discuss your questionnaire and get the opinions of all who will come. Don Olenhouse will M.C. the meeting, have a short program, and refreshments after.

I'm on a slow train to Kansas City—seems slow—and will catch a jet there for Omaha which won't take long. My mother hasn't been very well and went to the hospital Tuesday and then last night we got a call she had a coronary heart attack and that today and tomorrow will be the crucial time.

I did so want to be at the meeting but had worked up some facts on the issues you mention and Mary Compton will take my place. Last night about 11 we took the cookies I baked and the chocolate cake (door prize) and punch ingredients and coffee to their house and talked with Don. He said they'd do their best to get their opinions and would attempt to draw questions and answers from the audience and also to acquaint those who aren't too "interested in politics" with your good record, etc., for the fifth district.

I must go home—had planned to go Monday—then Friday, but after last evening's call felt it was urgent. I'm praying she will get along OK and enjoy a few more years with her family. She is 74 which isn't so old these days, but she has other things which complicate matters—very poor kid-

neys. Guess I'd never be ready to lose her, so will pray for her recovery and that she might not suffer great pain.

I don't know when I'll be back. Bob will be here on the job unless we need him there and plans to go to the meeting to help clean up after, etc., and help in any way.

We had discussed the questionnaire and are sending it in and will send the opinions of those there tonight within a week. Hope we get a good crowd, but if even 25 come, I'll feel it was worth every bit of effort.

Sincerely yours,

Clear Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the President now has what he needs—a clear authority to proceed to a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

This is the editorial opinion of the Charleston Daily Mail, which believes it has been made clear to all that the people and their representatives fully support the administration policies in Vietnam.

The paper states:

The choice is fairly simple, the United States can disengage. Or it can continue to apply the pressure until the Communists recognize that they, too, are confronted with the hard facts.

Believing that others will want to read this editorial in full, I herewith insert it in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, Mar. 3, 1966]

ON A SHOW OF HANDS, MR. JOHNSON WINS FULL AUTHORITY TO PROCEED

As much as anyone can, President Johnson has won the great debate over Vietnam. And he has won it fairly, handily and with a margin of safety which should dispose of, for the time being, any impression that the United States is joined in a war its people and their representatives do not support.

In the House of Representatives, the vote on a \$4.8 billion appropriations bill, was 392 to 4, or just about as unanimously as the House ever acts. In the Senate, on a companion measure, the vote was 93 to 2. And to make it perfectly clear, the Senate also defeated a motion by Senator WAYNE MORSE to repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution—92 to 5.

This is still short of a declaration of war and does not meet the objections of those who wish they could erase the history of the past 10 years. But this aside, it clears the air and reestablishes a sound basis for a continued war on or negotiation with Hanoi.

The MORGES, the GRUENINGS and the FULBRIGHTS have had their chance. With history to guide them, they are wiser now than they were then, and on points, at least, they are often right. The American policy in Vietnam has not been marked by much foresight. The fact remains that in Vietnam the United States is confronted by a condition, not a theory, and the President must deal with the realities, not with the regrets that they induce.

The choice is fairly simple: The United States can disengage. Or it can continue to apply the pressure until the Communists

A1456

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 15, 1966

recognize that they, too, are confronted with the hard facts.

How much damage has been done by encouraging them to believe that the President might yield under pressure on the home front is problematical. In any case, they can scarcely misread the rollcall or draw from it any encouragement.

As always, the dissident and fractious minority makes the most noise. In their way, they, too, perform a service. But on a show of hands, the President has what he needs—a clear authority to proceed to a negotiated peace.

How L.B.J. Is Running the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our President is a past master at the art of politics: he is not a man who makes hasty or snap decisions and his conduct of the war in Vietnam is an excellent demonstration of that fact.

The following article by Roscoe Drummond points out the salient features of this policy. The article appeared in the March 13, 1966, edition of the New York Herald Tribune and follows:

How L.B.J. Is Running the War
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—I would like to say a good word about President Johnson's management of the Vietnam war.

Obviously there is a great risk of timidly doing too little to arrest the aggression.

Obviously there is great danger of recklessly doing so much that Red China enters the fighting.

With these two opposite perils in mind, I cannot escape the feeling that many more Americans will come to see that the President is bringing to bear on the conduct of the war wisdom, caution, and determination.

What is the touchstone of wisdom in our role in Vietnam? Surely it is to do whatever is needed to secure South Vietnam from conquest and to use our massive military power in such a prudent and measured manner that Peiping is given no legitimate reason to enter the war.

Such a course will not get the easy plaudits of those who want to win quickly at any cost by bombing North Vietnam to bits.

Such a course will not get the praise of those who want to quit at any cost by pulling out.

Such a course will not get a high Gallup rating from those who suggest we haven't the resources to defend South Vietnam and that, anyway, a little aggression in southeast Asia is no concern to the United States.

As these conflicting views find their level in public opinion, I believe that the Nation, on reflection, will feel even more reassured that Gen. Curtis LeMay is not deciding the bombing over North Vietnam, that WAYNE MORSE is not managing the defense of South Vietnam, and that Senator FULBRIGHT is not deciding where aggression concerns the United States and where it doesn't.

During the period when he was determining how the mounting attacks directed from Hanoi should be met, President Johnson—as reported by Charles Roberts in his book, "L.B.J.'s Inner Circle"—remarked to his intimates: "I'm not going north with Curtis LeMay and I'm not going south with WAYNE MORSE."

Fortunately, the President is not easily pressured either by events or by extremist advice.

He did not act hastily; he acted deliberately.

He did not act recklessly; he acted with great care.

He did not act timidly; he committed the United States to do whatever is necessary to defend South Vietnam successfully—but no more.

These are the ingredients of mind which have marked the President's course in Vietnam—deliberateness, prudence, and determination.

What they have produced is a very clear and properly limited objective: To keep South Vietnam from being taken over by force.

And how is he acting to make it least likely that Red China will enter the war?

He is not using U.S. air power to bomb cities in the north.

He is not sending U.S. ground troops to occupy any part of North Vietnam.

He is not seeking the downfall of the Hanoi regime.

He is not asking for the unconditional surrender of Hanoi. He is asking only for an unconditional end to aggression against its neighbor.

Few Americans want to desert South Vietnam.

Few Americans want to wage the war so recklessly as to tempt Peiping to enter it.

The ingredients of President Johnson's conduct of the war—deliberateness, prudence, and determination—are the best assurance we can win without spreading it.

Uncle Stingy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most popular newspaper columnists in Santa Clara County in my congressional district is Mr. Frank Freeman, who writes a daily column in the San Jose Mercury entitled "Here 'Tis." Frank is well known by everyone, is highly respected, and his column, which usually deals with local personalities, is widely read. In a recent column, he made some points which concern national policies and I feel that they are so well done they should be brought to the attention of the entire House:

HERE 'TIS: UNCLE STINGY?
(By Frank Freeman)

Mrs. J. T. Bryant, of 1009 Corvette Drive, read it in her old hometown paper which picked it up from the Union County Leader of Clayton, N. Mex., so here's passing it along again—a sort of open letter to one Uncle Samuel, like so: "Hey, Uncle, how much does it cost to rear a child? You allow us taxpayers only \$600 a year to feed, clothe, house, and train a youngster. Yet to feed, clothe, house, and train a youngster in your Federal Government Job Corps you spent \$7,000 a year. Now, which is the correct figure? Either we're allowing you too much or you're not allowing us enough.

"You allow taxpaying parents a \$600 deduction for the care and feeding of each child—yet under the Cuban refugee program you assume minimal upkeep requires \$1,200

a year—and if the Cuban boy or girl is attending school, an extra \$1,000 a year. How come you shortchange the homefolks? In the austere environs of a Federal prison, you have discovered that it costs—to maintain one persons, with no frills, no luxuries, and no borrowing Dad's car—\$2,300 per year. By what rule of thumb do you estimate that Mom and Dad can do it for one-fourth that amount? Under social security, you will pay \$168 a month to maintain the elderly. What makes you think we can maintain our young'uns on \$50 a month?

"And, Uncle, your VISTA program (Volunteers in Service to America) spent \$3.1 million this last fiscal year to turn out only 202 trainees. That indicates that the cost of maintaining and training one youth for 1 year is more than \$15,000. Then how come we taxpaying parents get an exemption of only \$600 to maintain and train one youth for 1 year?

"Or let's see how much you spend upkeep-ing one youngster in military uniform. House, \$55.20 a month. Food, \$30.27 a month. Clothing upkeep, \$4.20 a month. That comes to \$1,076.04 a year. How in the world do you expect parents to provide all these things, plus clothes, recreation, books, medicine, for \$600 a year? With your own figures you admit it can't be done. With all our prosperity, you, Uncle, are still spending per year \$2.9 billion more for relief than during the depths of the depression. So it may be that you are uncommonly extravagant. However we try to rationalize and explain you and excuse you, it is still a hurtful affront when you allow us hard-working, dues-paying homefolks only \$600 a year to rear a legitimate child—while you, under ADC, will pay more than \$800 a year to upkeep an illegitimate one."

Bulgarian Liberation Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the peoples in the Balkan Peninsula is most characteristically marked by their subjugation to Ottoman Turkish despotism until the late 19th century. For more than 400 years these peoples, among the staunchest defenders of their freedom in Europe, lived under the ruthless regime of the sultans. The Bulgarian people suffered the same fate, and not until the 1870's were they able, with the effective aid of czarist Russia, to free themselves. This was accomplished during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78. Then Turkey was defeated, and as one of the conditions of the ensuing peace Russia secured Bulgaria's freedom. Thus the peace treaty signed on March 3, 1878, terminating that war, marked Bulgaria's liberation from Ottoman Turkish tyranny, and since that day March 3 has become a Bulgarian national holiday.

Today when the Bulgarian people are deprived of their freedom once more and are suffering under Communist totalitarianism, which in many ways seems more callous and ruthless than the regime of the sultans, that memorable day of 88 years ago naturally looms large in

March 15, 1966

**We Protest the National Policy in
Vietnam****EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. EDITH GREEN**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the March 7 issue of Christianity and Crisis succinctly outlines those issues which deeply trouble many of us who oppose escalation of the war in Vietnam. This article offers a brief and concise statement of main points which deserve the most searching kind of examination. For example, a recent newspaper reported that Red China's nuclear capacity is growing at a much more rapid rate than previously estimated. In view of our own national interests, it is a legitimate question then to ask if past and present U.S. policy toward Communist China is designed to diminish that hostility which makes nuclear power so dangerous. Does our policy of isolating China from the leavening influences of the world community really contribute to our own security? The article raises this question.

It may, perhaps, be inevitable that policies will become associated with the individuals who espouse them, and thus give those individuals a vested interest in defending policy rather than examining it. Yet, in terms of the Nation's future, it is of no consequence who is right and who is wrong—only what is right and what is wrong. None of us are infallible, and it is with this in mind that I ask simply that these basic issues be considered on their merits in as dispassionate and rational a way as possible—divorced from the increasingly bitter atmosphere of attack and defense.

The article follows:

**WE PROTEST THE NATIONAL POLICY IN
VIETNAM**

(NOTE.—The hardest strokes of heaven fall in history upon those who imagine that they can control things in a sovereign manner, as though they were kings of the earth, playing providence not only for themselves but for the far future—reaching out into the future with the wrong kind of farsightedness, and gambling on a lot of risky calculations in which there must never be a single mistake.)

(By Herbert Butterfield)

The U.S. involvement in southeast Asia has become a case study in Herbert Butterfield's thesis. In the last decade Christianity and Crisis has frequently appealed for a change in American policies in Asia. Now we must register our emphatic protest against the policies and acts that are leading to increasingly portentous war.

Nobody planned this war. Neither brute malice nor innocent miscalculation brought it about. It is the result of a series of fateful decisions in which human fallibility, accentuated by moral insensitivity and pretension, turned a brush-fire war into a major conflict. In the process the nature of the initial U.S. commitments has changed beyond recognition.

Beneath all the immediate perplexities is the deep confusion in our Government's aims. Sometimes the stated policy is to prevent any gains for communism. At other times it is to give the people of Vietnam

their free choice of a government—and that, everybody knows, may be a Communist government. Talk of unconditional readiness to negotiate is mixed with adamant unwillingness to concede anything. These contradictions may not be confusing the enemy, but they are certainly confusing the American public and our allies.

We would like to assume the best, although much that the administration does makes this difficult. Let us acknowledge that Washington has engaged in a dramatic peace offensive that has drawn scornful rebuffs. Let us grant that the national leaders have told the world and particularly the U.N. that we want a solution based on the Geneva accords of 1954, a solution that will offer self-determination to the people of Vietnam. Let us point out that we see slender clues of willingness to modify the refusals, previously adamant, to give the Vietcong a place in negotiations.

Even if this best possible case is made, the United States still finds itself engaged in a war that is destructive to the people whom we claim to be helping, to the peace of the world and to our best interests.

The burning of villages, the killing and maiming of civilians, area bombing and the use of napalm and chemical destruction of crops inflict immediate human suffering that makes incredible the official promises of pacification and remote benefits. Repeatedly such tactics alienate and harm the very people we purport to save.

The United States is concentrating on one dubious battleground the brainpower and resources needed for meeting a world that bristles with unsolved problems. Constructive acts in Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East get little attention because of the hypnotic preoccupation with east Asia.

Contrary to the evidence of history and the wisdom learned in Europe, our leaders still treat Asian communism as a single enemy. Instead of promoting diversity within it, their acts drive Ho Chi Minh to greater dependence on China (despite the traditional feelings of his people). Thus American policy creates the monolithic Communist unity that it fears.

The war in Asia aggravates irritations between the United States and the Soviet Union at a time when the two share more common purposes than in any period since World War II.

Our Nation is becoming increasingly lonely in the world, losing or embarrassing European, African, and Asian allies, and building a legacy of hatred and resentment for "neocolonialism."

The Government is neglecting or deferring its attacks upon urgent needs of American society needs that the President has heretofore met with impressive resourcefulness.

By continuing to isolate China from the world of nations, U.S. policy reinforces the Chinese paranoia and isolation that a wiser policy would seek to overcome. A look at a map of American bases near China makes obvious some reasons for Chinese fear and distrust.

Our society is letting the specific struggle in Vietnam blind us to the nature of the world revolution, which calls for far greater understanding and appreciation that we have yet shown.

Thus we find the American nation deeply committed to a self-defeating course of action. Every intensification of the war makes the ultimate resolution more difficult.

We do not pretend that there are ideal solutions. Rather than look for painless ways out, we need to compare various possibilities with the present grim realities, for example:

We are told that American prestige is at stake and that we cannot settle for anything less than victory. We answer that our country has shown in Korea that a strong people can afford to value peace above victory. We believe that a stubborn vanity,

provoking continued hostility, is more damaging to prestige than is a wisdom that seeks peace.

We are told that only our military power can protect our allies from vengeance at the hands of their enemies. We do not deny that all factions in Vietnam have a capacity for vengeance. Any settlement should make all possible provision for the protection of people. But we also know that our present policies inflict great cruelties on our friends as well as our enemies.

We are told that any concession will start dominoes falling throughout Asia. We do not accept this simplistic theory, especially when, as in Vietnam, the United States must both create and support the domino. (At the same time, we endorse efforts to strengthen viable governments and economies that afford alternatives to communism.) But we readily grant that a settlement in Vietnam will have consequences elsewhere. These must be compared with the evident effects of the present perilous course.

Our Government has sufficient political, military, and diplomatic ingenuity to work through these very real difficulties. What is lacking so far is the willingness to look at realities and the moral imagination to seek better methods than the present contradictory mixture of peaceful rhetoric and stubborn policy. If the President and the Secretary of State find the will and insight, they can devise the precise maneuvers that hold most hope.

Such maneuvers must show "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind"—to use a phrase from a more glorious time in our national history. They must involve a greater concern for the well-being of people than for ideological abstractions. They must include some sense of proportion in relating means to ends.

The shape of such a settlement may include a convening of the Geneva powers under the persuasion of the United Nations. More likely will be a series of steps of de-escalation, disengagement, multilateral diplomatic efforts, and economic reconstruction. Alternatives can be found to the present bitter impasse, but only if policymakers will give up the dogmatic illusions that lead to a fixation on rigid ends regardless of the costs.

Scripture warns that "where there is no vision the people perish." The failure of vision in our time is a blindness to realities no less than to ideals. The threat of this moment is a preoccupation with the enemy that destroys our society's power to understand itself or its foes. In such a time the greatest service to the society comes from those voices—in church, politics, and press—that risk the displeasure of the powers that be in order to challenge dogmatism that imperil ourselves and our world. To these voices we again add our own.

Signed:

The Editorial Board: John C. Bennett, Richard T. Baker, M. Searle Bates, Waldo Beach, Robert McAfee Brown, Wayne H. Cowan, Harvey Cox, Tom Driver, Johannes C. Hoekendijk, James Kuhn, Robert W. Lynn, John D. Maguire, Stephen C. Rose, Roger L. Shinn, Frances S. Smith, Robert W. Spike.

R. T. Swilling, Construction Contractor**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the March 1966 issue of the management

March 15, 1966

PROGRAM

1. Iskilmingo minejimo atidarymas: Ralp J. Valatka, DLOC valdybos pirmininkas.
2. Garbes prezidiumo pristatymas ir vellavu inesimas.
3. Programos vedejas: Dr. Kestutis Keblys.
4. Jungtiniu Amerikos Valstybiu Himnas.
5. Invokacija: Kun. Michael J. Kundrat.
6. Zuvusiuju uz Lietuvos laisve pagerbimas.
7. Michigan valstybes gubernatoriaus George Romney: proklamacijos skaitymas: Danduole Majauskaite.
8. Detroito miesto burmistro, Jerome P. Cavanagh: proklamacijos skaitymas, Viktorija Ciunkaite.
9. Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, G. Mennen Williams kalba.
10. Garbes sveciu pristatymas ir sveikinimai.
11. Dr. Tomo Remeikio kalba.
12. Rezoliuciju skaitymas ir priemimas, Algis Zaprackas.
13. Menine programa: Atlieka Sv. Antano parapijos mlsrus choras, vadovaujamas, Muz. A. Mateikos.
14. Lietuvos Himnas.
15. Elsena i miesto rotuse (city-county building) vellavos nuleidimui.

Electorial College Reforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Des Moines Register for March 7, 1966, carried a perceptive editorial commenting on a proposal by my colleague from Iowa, BERT BANDSTRA, dealing with electoral college reform.

Since this editorial may be of interest to my fellow Members, I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORMS

U.S. Representative BERT BANDSTRA, Democrat, of Iowa, has appeared before a Senate subcommittee to raise an important point concerning President Johnson's plan to abolish presidential electors. The electoral vote of the States would be retained, under Johnson's plan, but cast automatically for the presidential and vice-presidential candidates getting the highest popular vote in the State.

This would prevent the running of uncommitted electors, or the occasional case in which an elector bolts the ticket on which he was elected. Such devices might permit a minority to deadlock the electoral college, since a candidate must have a majority to be elected, and throw the choice of President into Congress for decision.

BANDSTRA favors the principal features of the Johnson plan, but he believes the requirement of an electoral college majority for election should be dropped. The candidate getting the highest electoral vote for President or Vice President should be declared elected whether he gets more than 50 percent of the electoral college vote or not, BANDSTRA argues. Congress would be called on to decide the election only in case of a tie under this suggestion.

The requirement that a candidate for an office have a clear majority to be elected usually is made to assure that the winner will have substantial support in office. This is desirable, but has no meaning when a candidate can get a majority of the electoral votes without getting a majority of popular votes, as has happened in connection with

the Presidency. It is popular support that is important in this case, not electoral votes.

Since the requirements for an electoral vote majority does not assure majority popular support, BANDSTRA seems to be correct in arguing that it serves no purpose and could be dropped, allowing the candidate with the highest electoral vote to win.

It also has the merit of reducing the electoral role of Congress to the lowest possible minimum. There is reason to fear and avoid as much as possible the chance of a presidential election by Congress.

The danger that the public desire may be thwarted by fractional interests is too great to allow the legislative power to name the Chief Executive any more often than is absolutely necessary.

A Tribute to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 14, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul Brindle, chairman of the International Crossroads Sunday Morning Breakfast here in Washington, is loved and admired by many of our colleagues who have been guest speakers at the Central Y.M.C.A. throughout the years.

It has been my pleasure upon several occasions to address the International Crossroads Breakfast around the birthday of George Washington. This year, Dr. Luther A. Smith, sovereign grand commander of 330 Scottish Rite Freemasonry, southern jurisdiction, United States, addressed the International Crossroads Breakfast on the subject "The Continuing Impact of the Life of George Washington." Dr. Smith made an excellent address.

Mr. Paul Brindle's sister Dr. Ether A. Brindle, wrote the following poem especially for this occasion:

A TRIBUTE TO WASHINGTON

February twenty-second, seventeen hundred thirty two,

There came into the loving home, a wee, dear baby, new;

George was the given name, you know, and Washington, surname;

How could any know that cold day, of his future life and fame?

He grew up much like any boy, in his day, of privileged class;

In home and school and plantation, much of his time he'd pass.

"Let truth abound" his father said, and live it by the rule.

So 'twas natural to speak the truth, at work, at play, at school.

Surveying was his chosen work, as a young man he'd pursue,

Which took him to the wilderness, of this beloved land so new.

When oppression became unbearable, then freedom must be won;

Thus the uniform of an officer he gallantly did don.

His heart bled within, at Valley Forge, as he saw upon the snow

The blood-stained prints of frozen feet; upon his knees he'd go

To implore God Almighty, His blessings to bestow; thus all can see

The hard-earned victory of freedom, the birth-pangs of liberty.

Yes, 'twas for liberty and freedom, this nation he did sire;

He's "The Father of his Country," one all Americans admire!

—Dr. Ethel A. Brindle.

Will the Loss of Abba Schwartz Take Our Immigration and Travel Policies Back to 1952?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal voiced the apprehensions of many of us when it commented in its March 12, 1966, editorial that:

Our immigration and travel policies were liberalized and humanized under Abba P. Schwartz. It would be most regrettable if this loss now should allow those who favor harsh and unreasoning policies to prevail again.

These policies are of primary concern to us here in Congress and I urge your consideration of this Journal editorial as well as a certain watchfulness over the direction our immigration and travel policies take in the future.

The article follows:

THE CASE OF ABBA SCHWARTZ

When John Kennedy became President, one of his desires was to liberalize passport and travel policies. To that end, he named Abba P. Schwartz as head of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Now Schwartz is out of a job.

The administration says that he resigned. He says that he is the victim of a plan to reorganize his bureau in such a way as to abolish it. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch quotes a Washington official as saying that Schwartz's removal is being disguised as reorganization. But more disturbing is the comment of another official: "Now we have gone right back to 1952." Those were the days when Senator McCARTHY intimidated Government until it adopted restrictive and vindictive travel policies.

From the start, Schwartz has battled with his subordinate, Mrs. Frances G. Knight, Director of the Passport Office. She objected to his policy of refusing to withhold passports from suspected Communists without allowing them to face their accusers. She called the policy "dangerous"—although the right to face accusers has been upheld by the courts in these cases. He has fought bans on travel to Communist China and Cuba and as result faced stern opposition in the State Department.

Schwartz was the principal architect of the long overdue changes in the immigration laws last year which abolish the unfair national origins quotas. He played a leading role in getting some 10,000 Cubans to this country recently. He has worked on the Vietnamese refugee problems and was engaged through the International Red Cross in trying to obtain release of some 200 Americans held by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

Our immigration and travel policies were liberalized and humanized under Schwartz. It would be most regrettable if his loss now should allow those who favor harsh and unreasoning policies to prevail again.

March 15, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1471

munists. They may be ruthless fanatics but they are not mad. A divided and brawling free world, however, by raising illusions in the citadels of world communism, may produce the miscalculations and over-confidence that could touch off the showdown nobody wants. Hence our unity, in depth and breadth, now and in the long run is our best, our only guarantee against universal holocaust.

OUR ONLY HOPE

We must, on both sides of the Atlantic, renounce cynicism and skepticism which block the road to understanding. We need, more than ever, true Western solidarity, resting on shared strengths and purposes—not merely an "alliance" in the technical, legalistic sense; we need a unity that compasses even the sacrifice of immediate self-interest for the long-term self-interests of our indivisible destiny.

It is in this spirit that the two Presidents should meet without delay. One hopes that Americans do not underrate the maturity and national aspirations of France; and that the French people do not dilute or destroy their contribution to the community of the free and, in particular, do not misjudge American anxieties over the deepening fissures in the structure of true alliance.

The last and best hope for the free world is to be found in the unshakeable solidarity of the United States, France, and their allies. Less than that would bring chaos, danger, and ultimately nuclear destruction. Isolationism has become an anachronism in our interdependent and menaced world. Let us be clear on the hard truth that it is no less anachronistic for France than for the United States.

Benefits Under the Cold War GI Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, since World War II, many American men have been called upon to serve in our Armed Forces to fight the cold war and protect the free world.

Like many of my colleagues, I vigorously supported enactment of the Veterans' Readjustment Benefits Act and was heartened when the President signed what is now referred to as the Great Society's cold war GI bill.

I recently received from the White House a letter pertaining to the application of the act to the Third Congressional District of Maryland, and I place the information in the Appendix of the RECORD, so Maryland veterans will be informed of their rightful benefits.

The letter follows:

Approximately 5,500 veterans in Maryland's Third Congressional District are potentially eligible for benefits and services under the new GI bill just signed by President Johnson.

The new GI bill provides education and training programs generally patterned after the highly successful GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict.

In the first year alone over 690 veterans are expected to take advantage of the educational benefits, according to statistics from the Veterans' Administration. This educational provision is expected to provide the

veterans in the district almost \$443,000 in direct benefits in that first year.

The educational provisions of the new bill go into effect June 1, 1966, giving the veteran ample time to plan his schooling program.

In addition to the educational benefits, the program is expected to provide VA guaranteed loans totaling \$598,000 to some 35 veterans in the first year.

The veterans covered under this bill are also eligible for hospital benefits, and 875 patient-days at a cost of \$22,500 are expected to be made available to applying veterans in the first year.

All veterans are eligible for educational and guaranteed home loan benefits who were on active duty more than 180 days after January 31, 1955, and honorably discharged, or who were discharged with less than 180 days service because of a service-incurred disability.

Under the education and training sections, monthly payments for full-time training are: \$100 for veterans without dependents, \$125 for veterans with one dependent, \$150 for veterans with more than one dependent.

Veterans eligible can receive up to 36 months of schooling or training on the basis of 1 month for each month spent in uniform.

The veteran must complete his program of education within 8 years after discharge.

The GI home loan provisions of the bill would increase activity in building and real estate activity throughout the country.

The formula for eligibility of the veteran to participate in the GI home loan program is the same as that already in existence; that is, 10 years from the date of discharge, plus 1 year for each 3 months served.

Entitlement shall not continue beyond 20 years, nor shall it expire before 10 years.

Guaranteed or insured loan ceilings remain at \$7,500.

Medical and hospital care is available on the same basis as for wartime veterans.

Other benefits include burial benefits, employment assistance, and veterans' preference in Federal employment.

A Military Secret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the complete failure of the administration's foreign policy is seen in the total disregard which the Canadian Government has for the complications in southeast Asia. While the Johnson administration commits American troops to battle and loss of life in Vietnam, Canadians reap a profit in sales to Red China, secure in the knowledge that the U.S. military defense is protecting them from a sneak Communist attack. The Chicago Tribune, in a very timely and appropriate editorial, illustrates this situation:

A MILITARY SECRET?

The question was a routine one. Our correspondent in Ottawa, Eugene Griffin, asked the appropriate Canadian official how many dollars were spent in Canada last year by the U.S. Defense Department. The answer had always been readily forthcoming.

But not this time. "The sensitivity at the American end is very great," the official

explained. The Canadian Government had promised Washington that it wouldn't make the figures public.

Sensitivity? We doubt that any of Ho Chi Minh's agents are snooping about trying to find out what we spend in Canada, especially when the total figures are readily available in the budget and elsewhere. The national security is hardly at stake.

The sensitivity here, we suspect, is of a different nature. The Johnson administration has been blaming private business for the persistent deficit in our foreign payments, and has called on businessmen to reduce the number of dollars they spend abroad. Administration spokesmen have even threatened formal controls if the "voluntary" method fails.

Meanwhile the United States was spending about \$600 million a year on defense material from Canada before 1965, and last year the figure no doubt went up substantially. Whatever it was, it was large enough to make any businessman sit up and take notice, especially when his own spending was restricted.

If all of this money is being spent on essential military supplies that cannot be obtained in the United States, no businessman is likely to complain. By trying to keep the figure secret, therefore, the Government seems to be inviting the suspicion that its spending is open to criticism. Secrecy on matters like this is hardly going to create confidence in businessmen or encourage their cooperation.

The Untold Story: Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by Mr. Joseph Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post on Friday, March 4, 1966:

THE UNTOLD STORY: REPORTING

(By Joseph Alsop)

It is against custom; but it is an unfortunate necessity to end this series with a warning. Everyone should now be warned to suspect some of the most important reporting from Vietnam.

Consider for example, a very great newspaper's two successive stories, sent from Saigon on February 17 and 18. Both concerned the big spoiling operation General Westmoreland mounted not long ago in Binh Dinh Province. The operation's aim, according to the first story, was to find and destroy four regiments of enemy regulars, half Vietcong and half North Vietnamese.

In reality, the original aim was to strike only two enemy regiments, the 18th Regiment of the North Vietnamese 325th Division and the 2d Vietcong Main Force Regiment. Almost at once, however, a third, predominantly northern regiment with the enemy code name of "Quyet Tam" was discovered by our troops. All were operating under a temporary divisional headquarters with the code name "Sau Vang." None of this matters much, compared to the following flat, unqualified assertion, in the first of these two stories:

"Not one of these (enemy) regiments has yet been drawn into battle."

A1472

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 15, 1966

The story did not stop there, either. Both the Binh Dinh operation and General Westmoreland's basic strategy were roundly condemned as failures, on the ground that the target regiments were not "drawn into battle." An accompanying editorial all but crowed over this report of failure of American troops in the field.

Hence it was a bit bewildering to learn from the second story, by another reporter, on the same paper, that our troops had captured a very high-ranking Vietcong officer, Lt. Col. Dong Duan, commander of the 93d Battalion of the 2d Vietcong Main Force Regiment. This story also repeated that our troops had "not made contact" with their four target-regiments; but now these regiments were differently described, as entirely North Vietnamese.

This change of description was wholly incorrect; for the 2d Vietcong Main Force Regiment had been one of the target-regiments from the very outset, as implied in the first story. But as this was the perhaps inconvenient fact and if Dong Duan's outfit was never "drawn into battle," how the devil did a battalion commander get himself captured on the battlefield?

These fairly lurid inconsistencies led to consultation of this reporter's Vietnamese notes, and far more important, to telegraphic inquiries to Westmoreland's headquarters in Saigon. In summarizing the results, one must begin by pointing out that a lot depends on what you mean by "contact" and "battle." The Binh Dinh fighting certainly did not resemble the Iadrang fighting last October.

The regular troops of the target-regiments were instead brigaded, in battalion and even in company strength, with units of the Vietcong local forces and even with guerrilla bands; and all were supported by press-ganged groups of peasant porters. Thus in any engagement, the regulars were likely to be encountered in a mixture with the other listed elements.

Even so, before this reporter left Saigon, General Westmoreland gave the considered judgment that two of the target-regiments of enemy regulars had suffered losses that would put these outfits out of action for another 3 months.

By February 26 (for the operation in Binh Dinh continued defiantly, despite its stern condemnation as a sad failure on February 17) the U.S. field headquarters was reporting the possible indications of the "complete collapse" of a third target-regiment. These signs of lapse were the continuous increase in numbers of weapons abandoned on the battlefield, plus numbers of defecting enemy troops without precedent in previous experience.

Thus three of the target regiments, though allegedly never drawn into battle, were at least very gravely damaged; and one of the three may well have been scrubbed right off the order of battle. As of February 26, Westmoreland's headquarters tallied of the enemy troops killed in action had reached 1,799 by body count, with another 1,700 estimated as killed but not counted.

There are three things to be said about this. First, duplications in body counts sometimes occur in the heat of combat. Second, these duplications are normally trifling, compared to the enemy losses that are uncounted because of the Communist habit of running extreme risks to remove their dead from the battlefield. Only a very rare body count will include victims of our air power, for instance; yet this is the arm the Vietcong fear the most.

Third, it is highly conservative to assume that severely wounded enemy troops were at least double the number of those killed. Add that to more than 400 enemy troops have been captured, and defecting enemy soldiers to date have totaled 470. Thus the enemy's

losses of all categories, including guerrillas as well as regulars, must clearly have run far above 7,000 men.

It can be seen, then, why General Westmoreland's headquarters now estimates that 11 enemy battalions, or the equivalent, have been put out of action in the Binh Dinh fighting, which is proudly characterized as "the most successful combined operation to date." The characterization is justified, unless Westmoreland's staff is playing ducks and drakes with the facts.

And who is more likely to play ducks and drakes with the facts—reporters rather obviously reflecting the outspoken preconceptions of a great newspaper, or General Westmoreland, who is one of the soberest and most brilliant field commanders in U.S. history?

Extortion, District of Columbia Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 15, 1966

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Lynchburg News, Lynchburg, Va., of a recent date and reprinted in the Union Star, Brookneal, Va., on Thursday, March 10, 1966. This editorial constitutes a very poignant statement of the horrendous conditions existing in the District of Columbia.

The Federal Government should give consideration to protecting the citizens of the Nation's Capital and leave to the States and localities the enforcement of law and order and the suppression of public mischief. On the contrary it seems that the Washington government tolerates the unspeakable evils existing here in the District of Columbia while sending its agents into every nook and corner of the country, particularly the Southern States, who, whether intended or not, harass and impede the law enforcement officers of those areas in protecting the citizens in their right to pursue their normal and lawful avocations.

The editor of the Union Star is Mr. Herman Ginther whose father before him published this extraordinarily useful weekly newspaper. Young Mr. Ginther is an outstanding citizen, possessing sterling qualities of character.

It will be interesting, I am sure, to the Members of the Congress and others to know that the publishers of the Lynchburg News, Col. Carter Glass III, and Hon. Thomas R. Glass, are the grandsons of the late Honorable Carter Glass, one of the outstanding Americans of this century who served as a member of the Cabinet of the late President Woodrow Wilson, and who represented Virginia with distinction in the U.S. Senate from 1919 to 1946.

The editorial hereinabove referred to is as follows:

EXTORTION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STYLE

The evidence has been piling up through the years: some of those so-called civil

rights organizations are nothing more than fronts for rackets operated for the personal profit of their leaders. Still the Justice Department and the Internal Revenue Service look the other way. Any crime, it seems, can be committed in the name of civil rights—even cheating the tax collector, and robbing others of their civil rights.

But give 'em enough rope. At last one of these rights groups—the far-left Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which, incidentally is none of those things—has overreached itself.

Under the pretense of fighting for home rule in Washington—last year it was advocating an African-style revolution in Mississippi—SNCC is demanding that all Washington, D.C., merchants and businessmen sign petitions for home rule, send telegrams to the President and Congress, buy and display "Free D.C." emblems and contribute to a \$100,000 fund to campaign for home rule.

SNCC has laid it on the line; it won't waste time begging the merchants, says SNCC Washington Director Marion Barry, Jr. Either they sign up and fork over the money or their names go on the boycott list. They also run the risk of having their display windows bashed in, being picketed, harassed, and otherwise intimidated.

Such tactics, as U.S. Senator ROBERT BYRD, of West Virginia, told the Senate last week, amount to "extortion, intimidation, and coercion."

The members of this newly formed committee, Senator BYRD snapped, "loudly proclaim themselves the self-styled liberators of the city from political slavery, and, in the same voice, announce their intentions to crush, by resorting to an economic boycott, the individual merchant's right to his own viewpoint."

What next? If the SNCC gets away with this extortion scheme, it will be able to extract money from merchants and individuals on any pretext.

Where will this money be spent? Upon whom? And for what? What books will be audited and who will do the auditing? Are those who were forced to contribute against their will to have a voice in determining how the money will be spent? Senator BYRD asked all these questions and more.

Only the Justice Department and the IRS can supply the answers, after a thorough investigation. For what this bogus "committee" is doing is no different than what Al Capone did a generation ago—on a much smaller scale—in Chicago.

Scarface Al might have had more success if he had had the allies SNCC has in Washington. None other than the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Suffragan Episcopal bishop, has joined SNCC in demanding tribute and support from the Capital's 7,000 merchants.

"We are sorry this kind of militancy (!) is necessary to bring to people the right to vote," Bishop Moore declared, "but all other methods have failed."

People must be robbed, threatened, coerced, and intimidated so they can have the right to vote? As a matter of fact, Washingtonians can vote in Federal elections, which is as it should be, for Washington is a Federal City—owned by and supported by all 50 States.

What this bishop is saying—and many other churchmen today echo these sentiments—is that the ends justify the means. So, he is ready to sanction extortion, intimidation and worse to gain those ends. This is called the "new religion"—but it isn't new. The first bully, the first robber, the first thief practiced this religion, and the Communists and Socialists practice it today. Look at any country where they are in power. Any of them.

If these blackjack tactics pay off and the Congress is bullied into giving Washington home rule, who do you think will rule? The